

Vol. XXX

JUNE, 1935

No. 2

# MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

*Chew Family*  
*p. 157*



PUBLISHED BY  
THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

ISSUED QUARTERLY  
ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, \$3.00-SINGLE NUMBERS, 75 cts.

BALTIMORE

## THE ENDOWMENT FUND.

---

The attention of members of the Society is again called to the urgent need for an adequate endowment fund. Our possessions are wonderful, but lack of means has prevented their proper exploitation, so that they are largely inaccessible to students. Rare items of Maryland interest frequently escape us because no funds are available for their purchase. A largely increased sustaining membership will help somewhat, but an endowment is a fundamental need. Legacies are of course welcomed, but present-day subscriptions will bring immediate results. **SUBSCRIBE NOW!**

---

## FORM OF BEQUEST

---

*"I give and bequeath to The Maryland Historical Society the sum of \_\_\_\_\_dollars"*

# ARCHIVES OF MARYLAND

Edited by J. HALL PLEASANTS, M. D.

Published by authority of the State

---

## VOLUME LI

Proceedings of the Court of Chancery of Maryland,  
1669-1679.

(Court Series 5)

---

The fifty-first volume of the Maryland Archives, the fifth of the Court Series, is one of the outstanding issues of this distinguished series. Aside from the inherent interest of the body of the text itself, the letter of transmittal which serves as a preface to the work, contains a comprehensive summary of the matter and is in effect an important historical paper in itself. This is followed by an "Introduction to the Legal Procedure" contributed by the Honorable Carroll T. Bond, Chief Judge of the Maryland Court of Appeals; and this in turn is followed by a scholarly monograph "The First Century of the Court of Chancery" an illuminating discussion of the history and growth of the Chancery procedure of this State. In the preparation of the legal section of the index, the Editor has had the collaboration of Herbert T. Tiffany, Esq. the Reporter of the Court of Appeals, so that the volume is of the greatest interest and value to the legal profession, as well as to the lay reader. Volume fifty-one is an honor to the Society, to the editor, and to his distinguished collaborators.

# BENEFACTORS AND CONTRIBUTORS TO THE FUNDS OF THE SOCIETY

Mrs. Mary Washington Keyser, Gift of the Buildings and grounds of the Society (1916).	
George Peabody, Gift (1866).....	\$20,000.00
J. Wilson Leakin, Bequest (1923), Historical relics and.....	10,000.00
Drayton Meade Hite, Gift (1919).....	1,000.00
and Bequest (1923).....	6,000.00
Mrs. Drayton Meade Hite, Bequest (1927).....	4,000.00
Mendes Cohen, Bequest (1915).....	5,000.00
Mrs. Caroline J. Lytle (1928).....	5,000.00
Van Lear Black, Gift.....	1,500.00
Miss Eleanor S. Cohen, Gifts (1919), Historical relics and \$300, Memorial to her parents, Israel and Cecilia E. Cohen (1926)	1,000.00
Miss Susan Dobbin Leakin (1924), Preparation of J. Wilson Leakin room and contribution to its contents.	
Charles Exley Calvert, Gift.....	1,150.00
Mrs. Thomas B. Gresham, Bequest (1926).....	1,200.00
Isaac Henry Ford, Bequest (1916).....	1,000.00
W. Hall Harris, Gift.....	1,000.00
Isaac F. Nicholson, Gift (1909).....	1,000.00
Isaac Tyson Norris, Gift (1916).....	1,000.00
J. Henry Stickney, Bequest (1892).....	1,000.00
Mrs. Emilie McKim Reed, Bequest (1926).....	1,000.00
Henry Stockbridge, Gift (1920).....	1,000.00
DeCourcy W. Thom, Gift.....	1,000.00
Mrs. DeCourcy W. Thom, Gift.....	1,000.00
W. G. Baker, Gift.....	500.00
Mrs. W. Hall Harris, Gift.....	500.00
Adelaide S. Wilson, Gift.....	500.00
J. Appleton Wilson, Gift.....	500.00
William Power Wilson, Gift.....	500.00
Mrs. Rebecca Lanier King, Bequest (1928).....	500.00
McHenry Howard, Gift.....	333.34
Charles McHenry Howard, Gift.....	333.33
Elizabeth Gray Howard, Gift.....	333.33
Simon Dalsheimer, Gift.....	300.00
Miles White, Jr., Gift.....	300.00

Miss Nellie Williams, Gift.....	\$ 200.00
Charles C. Homer, Jr., Gift.....	150.00
Raphael Semmes, Gifts.....	140.00
Mrs. George F. Libby, Gifts.....	125.00
Samuel M. Wilson, Gift.....	120.00
Louis H. Dielman, Gift.....	100.00
R. C. Hoffman, Gift.....	100.00
Henry P. Hynson, Gift.....	100.00
William Ingle, Gift.....	100.00
Mrs. Rebecca Littlejohn, Gift.....	100.00
John H. Morgan, Gift.....	100.00
Lawrence J. Morris, Life Membership.....	100.00
Mrs. Charlotte Gilman Paul, Gift.....	100.00
Mrs. Mary B. Redwood, Life Membership.....	100.00
Mrs. Mary Clough Cain, Life Membership.....	100.00
George Harvey Davis, Life Membership.....	100.00
Mrs. Ida M. Shirk, Life Membership.....	100.00
Mrs. Joseph Y. Jeanes, Life Membership.....	100.00
Bernard C. Steiner, Gift.....	100.00
J. Alexis Shriver, Life Membership.....	100.00
Mr. Edmund Key, Life Membership.....	100.00
Edwin Warfield, Jr., Gift.....	75.00
Mrs. Emma U. Warfield, Gift.....	75.00
Blanchard Randall, Gift.....	43.42
Ferd. Bernheimer, Gift.....	30.00
Walter I. Dawkins, Gift.....	25.00
William J. Donnelly, Gift.....	25.00
A. E. Duncan, Gift.....	25.00
Mrs. E. Edmunds Foster, Gift.....	25.00
John W. Marshall, Gift.....	25.00
John Parker, Gift.....	25.00
Mrs. Joseph Y. Jeanes.....	25.00
Daniel Annan, Gift.....	20.00
C. C. Shriver, Gift.....	20.00
Mrs. Francis T. Redwood, Gift.....	16.00
Mrs. John H. Sherburne, Gift.....	10.00
Mrs. Annie Leakin Sioussat, Gift.....	10.00
Samuel Grafton Duvall, Gift.....	10.00
Mrs. V. E. Mohler, Gift.....	10.00
William B. Levy, Gift.....	5.00
Philip Francis Trippe, Gift.....	5.00

# THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

INCORPORATED 1843.

H. IRVINE KEYSER MEMORIAL BUILDING,  
201 W. MONUMENT STREET,  
BALTIMORE.

---

## OFFICERS.

*President,*  
CLINTON L. RIGGS,

*Vice-Presidents*  
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, J. HALL PLEASANTS.  
RICHARD M. DUVALL.

*Corresponding Secretary,*  
J. ALEXIS SHRIVER.

*Recording Secretary,*  
JAMES E. HANCOCK.

*Treasurer,*  
HEYWARD E. BOYCE.

---

## THE COUNCIL.

THE GENERAL OFFICERS

AND REPRESENTATIVES OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

G. CORNER FENHAGEN,	Representing the Trustees of the Athenaeum.
J. HALL PLEASANTS,	" Committee on Publication.
HENRY J. BERKLEY, M. D.,	" Committee on the Library.
WILLIAM INGLE,	" Committee on Finance.
DANIEL R. RANDALL,	" Committee on Membership.
LAURENCE H. FOWLER,	" Committee on the Gallery.
KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD,	" Committee on Addresses.
WILLIAM B. MARYE,	" Committee on Genealogy.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
FRANCIS JAMES JACKSON AND NEWSPAPER PROPAGANDA IN THE UNITED STATES, 1809-1810. <i>By Josephine Fisher,</i> . . . . .	93
"PATOWMECK ABOVE YE INHABITANTS." PART II. <i>By William B. Marye,</i> . . . . .	114
THE BALTIMORE CLIPPER AND THE STORY OF AN OLD BALTIMORE SHIP-BUILDER. <i>By James E. Hancock,</i> . . . . .	138
EARLY MARYLAND NEWSPAPERS. <i>By George C. Keidel, Ph. D.,</i> . . .	149
CHEW FAMILY. <i>By Francis B. Culver,</i> . . . . .	157
NOTES AND QUERIES, . . . . .	176

---

### *Committee on Publications*

SAMUEL K. DENNIS, *Chairman*

JOHN M. VINCENT,

J. HALL PLEASANTS.

---

LOUIS H. DIELMAN,  
*Editor.*

# MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

---

VOL. XXX.

JUNE, 1935.

No. 2.

---

## FRANCIS JAMES JACKSON AND NEWSPAPER PROPAGANDA IN THE UNITED STATES, 1809-1810.

By JOSEPHINE FISHER.

---

In September 1809, the new British Minister, Francis James Jackson, arrived in the United States. His predecessor, Erskine, had been recalled because the British government considered that he had disobeyed his instructions in making an agreement with the American government for the settlement of the difficulties which had arisen between the two countries as a result of the war between Great Britain and France. The agreement had been disavowed by the British government.

In a despatch to Canning, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, marked "separate and secret" and sent soon after his arrival, Jackson said:

Perceiving the extreme activity of the Party in this Country which is hostile to His Majesty's interest, and the unremitting zeal with which in particular they employ the Press as a Means of transfusing their ideas and corrupting the Publick Mind, I deem it to be a part of my Duty to endeavor to counteract the otherwise inevitable effect of their Measures. I shall therefore try to get one or more able Writers to exert themselves in favor

This article is part of a dissertation presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Bryn Mawr College by Josephine Fisher in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The completed dissertation is on file in the Bryn Mawr College Library.



of the British cause. The price of this sort of Labor, is not, I am told, very high here, and three or four hundred pounds will go a great way in obtaining the assistance of the Newspaper and Pamphlet Writers.<sup>1</sup>

In carrying out this duty Jackson was able to combine the attempt to frustrate the plans of the anti-British party with the giving of aid to a friend in need. Immediately upon his arrival in Washington, he had received a letter signed "J. R." in which the writer informed him that he was encouraged to write because he had learned of

the probability of your being able to offer me some employment connected with your Mission, and the long intimacy which has subsisted between your Excellency's family and mine emboldens me in the hope that for their sakes you will be willing to exert yourself on my behalf. I take it for granted that my brother acquainted your Excellency with the leading particulars of my situation; and I am aware that you may probably have thence formed opinions and received impressions not much in my favor.<sup>2</sup>

But, the writer continued, he trusted that the good opinion of his character held by some of the most reputable men of New York would prove to Jackson that "the errors of extreme youth do not necessarily entail their evil habits upon the after man." He requested Jackson to address his answer to "J. Rose."<sup>3</sup>

Jackson replied immediately and suggested that J. R. come to Washington to see him. At the same time he advised "the propriety of not disclosing among your friends at New York the object of your journey, or the place which you mean to visit, and that you should not appear on your arrival here to come purposely to see me."<sup>4</sup> Since J. R. had explained that

<sup>1</sup> Public Record Office, London. Foreign Office, series 5 (United States) volume 64, Jackson to Canning, October 18, 1809. Hereafter these documents will be quoted as F. O. 5.

<sup>2</sup> F. O. 353, 59, J. R. to Jackson, New York, September 11, 1809. F. O. 353 refers to the Jackson papers in the Public Record Office.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> F. O. 353, 59, Jackson to J. R., September 25, 1809.

his means did not permit his making the journey to Washington unaided, Jackson enclosed fifty dollars.<sup>5</sup>

J. R. saw Jackson in Washington and on October 11th he was again in New York and very zealous to aid the British Minister in counteracting the work of the anti-British party.<sup>6</sup> In the *Evening Post*, one of the leading Federalist newspapers, published in New York and edited by William Coleman, a communication appeared on October 13th, signed by "Philo" and with the heading, "Magna est Veritas et Prevalebit." The writer said that it was his intention to reveal the real causes of the disavowal of the Erskine agreement by the British government; he would prove that Erskine had disregarded both the letter and the spirit of his instructions and that the prevalent belief in the existence of two sets of instructions was completely erroneous; <sup>7</sup> he hoped that, since he was "possessed of means of the most accurate information . . ." to be able to "erect the banners of triumphant truth on the ruins of defeated error."<sup>8</sup>

The day after the appearance of Philo's article, J. R. informed the British Minister that he had sent the introductory address to Coleman with an anonymous note, and that the article had appeared in the *Evening Post*. The letter continued,

I shall therefore be much obliged by your commenting to me on your earliest convenience such instructions as you may

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> F. O. 353, 59, J. R. to Jackson, October 11, 1809.

<sup>7</sup> Jackson had informed Canning that an attempt had been made to induce the American people to believe that "the disavowal of the Arrangement made here . . . was the Effect of a deliberate Plan of Perfidy . . . practiced by the British Government . . . that His Majesty's Minister in this Country had in fact been authorized to make the Agreement in question, whilst his conduct in so doing was disavowed for the purpose of drawing out of the American Ports and placing within reach of British Cruizers the number of ships . . . which had been secured from Depredation by the Embargo—With this View it is supposed that Mr. Erskine was supplied with a double set of Instructions of discordant tenor, and that it is only one part of them that has been made publick. . . ." F. O. 5, 64, Jackson to Canning, September 13, 1809.

<sup>8</sup> *Evening Post*, October 13, 1809.

deem requisite for the establishment of the first point I have proposed of Mr. Erskine's instructions and his conduct. I am well pleased that Coleman added no remarks of his own as there will be [less] ground for the imputation of connivance on his part and less anxiety on the part of the democrats to discover the writer or the channel of information.<sup>9</sup>

Jackson replied,

Your introductory paper did very well. You may follow it up by a comparison between E's instructions and the arrangement which he concluded here. . . . But what you must particularly insist upon is that this Gov<sup>t</sup> has no right to complain of the Disavowal which ought to have been anticipated because they knew at the time that he was disobeying his Instructions—in fact were chiefly instrumental in inducing him to do so—for it is obvious that the conditions which he was weak enough to accept were suggested by Mr. Smith<sup>10</sup> in the room of those which Mr. Erskine did propose to him—though *it is said* that he did not, as he might have done, communicate to him his original instructions; you may augur upon the improbability of this assertion—from the circumstances of E's being a young and inexperienced diplomat who w<sup>d</sup> gladly have availed himself of such a liberty from his court to render his overture the more intelligible. . . . You may spin this out and end by declaring your disbelief in this assertion. That this Gov<sup>t</sup> knew all along that E. was under an error and that therefore by proceeding as they did . . . they became Parties to the deception and had no right to expect his Act to be ratified and still less to complain of the Disavowal of it.<sup>11</sup>

Philo's second article, which appeared on November 4th, began with an apology for the delay, caused by "unforeseen circumstances," in continuing the discussion. It is possible that the unforeseen circumstances were the result of Jackson's being too much occupied in his negotiations with the Secretary of State to find time to supply J. R. with the necessary information. This article followed the British Minister's suggestions

<sup>9</sup> F. O. 353, 61, J. R. to Jackson, October 14, 1809. This communication was written between the lines of another letter, probably in lemon or milk.

<sup>10</sup> Robert Smith, of Baltimore, Secretary of State in Madison's cabinet.

<sup>11</sup> F. O. 353, 60. Unsigned, dated "25th."

faithfully and in some instances his actual wording was adopted.<sup>12</sup>

An announcement that the editor wished to have an interview with Philo appeared in the *Evening Post* and J. R. accepted the invitation. In describing the interview to Jackson, he said,

I saw Mr. C. yesterday and was pleased to find that a republication has taken place in almost all the respectable Federal papers in the Union—He informed me that much enquiry has been made about the author; but as he was himself at that time literally in the dark he could give no satisfactory answer and he is bound as a man of honor to be equally uncommunicative now. He told me that from a similarity of handwriting he had suspected Col. Barclay<sup>13</sup> to have been the writer. . . . He expressed his anxiety to have the discussion continued. . . . I have stated the above circumstances as a prelude to request that if there be any facts bearing strongly on the ensuing points, which I am not yet possessed of, you will have the goodness to communicate them at your earliest leisure. C. has no suspicion, nor did he make any inquiry into the sources of my information; and therefore I should not wish to be later than Monday or Tuesday next before I transmit to him the next number, lest he should imagine that I am waiting for instructions.<sup>14</sup>

In Philo's third and last communication, which appeared in the *Evening Post* of November 18th, J. R. used another suggestion given him by Jackson about Erskine's instructions. Jackson had written, "Yr. second point is a matter of fact—No secret instructions exist. . . . Your reasoning on it must turn on . . . the certainty of exposure . . . if not true. . . . Mr. Erskine has powerful friends in the British Parliament."<sup>15</sup> Philo maintained that the non-existence of the instructions,

<sup>12</sup> Philo said that Erskine "was a young and inexperienced diplomat. Surely then he would gladly have availed himself of such a liberty given him by his government of making his overtures the more intelligible." *Evening Post*, November 4, 1809.

<sup>13</sup> British Consul General in New York.

<sup>14</sup> F. O. 353, 59, J. R. to Jackson, November 8, 1809.

<sup>15</sup> F. O. 353, 60. Unsigned, dated "October 25th."

which it had been claimed that Erskine possessed, was proved by the fact that had they existed Erskine's friends in Parliament would have discovered them and used them to "exculpate him from the blame which was attached to him by the Ministry. . . . Lord Erskine has written a pamphlet in defence of his son . . . but he has not ventured to make the assertion which I have now been exposing."<sup>16</sup>

Jackson sent more information to J. R. but no other communications from Philo appeared in the *Evening Post*, perhaps because Jackson's letter arrived at the time that the American government broke off relations with the British minister and the public was probably more interested in the recent development in foreign affairs than in tracing the causes of past misunderstandings.

Jackson began his last instructions by warning J. R. to write in lemon because the correspondence of a foreign minister was usually examined at the post office. He advised J. R. to say that he had heard that Jackson had offered proposals to the American government for an arrangement of the controversy resulting from the attack made by the *Leopard* on the *Chesapeake* but "that he has not yet been able to obtain an answer to them—but that this Gov<sup>t</sup> is in the habit of not returning answers—as in the case of Don Onis<sup>17</sup> who complains bitterly that he could not obtain an answer to a civil letter which he wrote to the Sect'y of State."<sup>18</sup> Jackson concluded his letter by informing J. R. that he might state "that there is perhaps some Truth in the Newspaper reports that the Negotiation with Engl<sup>d</sup> has been rudely suspended on the part of the American Sect'y of State."<sup>19</sup>

A second Federalist newspaper which Jackson used for the purpose of counteracting the activities of the anti-British party, was the *Federal Republican*, published in Baltimore and edited by Jacob Wagner. Wagner had been chief clerk of the State Department under Timothy Pickering and, according to

<sup>16</sup> *Evening Post*, November 18, 1809.

<sup>17</sup> The Spanish Minister.

<sup>18</sup> F. O. 353, 60.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*

Henry Adams, "was retained in that office by Secretary Madison until 1807, when he resigned the place and made use of his knowledge to attack Madison in the press."<sup>20</sup> Associated with Wagner in directing the policy of the *Federal Republican* was Alexander Contee Hanson. His father was at one time Washington's private secretary and later became chancellor of Maryland. In 1812 the younger Hanson became the leader in an attempt to defend the freedom of the press in Baltimore. After war had been declared the editors of the *Federal Republican* continued to defend the policies of Great Britain and to attack those of their own government. In June a mob destroyed their printing office, while the civil authorities of Baltimore made little attempt to interfere. Jacob Wagner moved to the District of Columbia, where he continued to print his paper in Georgetown. Hanson, however, "and several of the Baltimore Federalists were not disposed to tolerate the dictation of a mob; and . . . some of them determined upon an attempt as foolhardy as it was courageous."<sup>21</sup> About twenty of them, including General Henry Lee and General Lingan, fortified a house on Charles Street which they proposed to defend while Hanson printed the *Federal Republican* there. On July 27th the mob attacked the house with cannon; the defenders were induced to surrender themselves to the civil authorities and were placed in the city jail, where inadequate measures were taken for their defense. The mob succeeded in breaking into the jail and Hanson and his associates received such brutal treatment that General Lingan died and General Lee was crippled.<sup>22</sup>

Among the Jackson papers are many letters signed by Peter Branson or P. B. which were probably written by Alexander Hanson. This conclusion is based on the similarity of the handwriting and the fact that although much of the correspondence concerned the *Federal Republican* there does not seem to have been anyone named Peter Branson who was con-

<sup>20</sup> Adams, Henry, *History of the United States*, vol. VI, p. 406.

<sup>21</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 407.

<sup>22</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 406-8.

nected with the paper. Precautions were taken to conceal the identities of both the correspondents. In his first letter to Jackson, Branson wrote, "Permit me to suggest that, for fear of accidents, it will be well to adopt some feigned signature to your letters. Our remarks may then be more free."<sup>23</sup> It may well be that the writer had already adopted this precaution. In another letter, P. B. advised Jackson "to get Mr. Oliver to enclose your letter to his brother John, who will convey it to me through the post office here with great security, or he can leave it at the office which is near him."<sup>24</sup> I prefer some method of this kind in hearing from you as I begin to fear the suspicion of the post-master."<sup>25</sup> On December 26th, William Wood, the British Consul in Baltimore, informed Jackson that he had received the letter sent him by Jackson "under cover for A. C. H." [Alexander Contes Hanson] who had gone to Philadelphia before the letter had arrived.<sup>26</sup> In a letter to Jackson, written on December 27th, P. B. used the phrase, "according to my present impressions, when I saw you in Philadelphia. . . ." <sup>27</sup>

The close connection between P. B. and Hanson is demonstrated in a letter in which P. B. asked Jackson to

Be so good as to inform your friend that A. C. Hanson leaves the state of Maryland on Tuesday, for the purpose of adjusting an affair of honor with Cap<sup>t</sup> Gordon, the officer of the Frigate Chesapeake, when she struck her colors to . . . the Leopard. Your friend will therefore do well to discontinue his communications until he is apprized of the result, as they may not come to hand.<sup>28</sup>

Four days later P. B. wrote, "Inform your friend that the affair of honor between Mr. Hanson and Mr. Gordon has termi-

<sup>23</sup> F. O. 353, 61, Peter Branson to Jackson, December 9, 1809.

<sup>24</sup> Robert and John Oliver, merchants, lived on Gay Street. The office of the *Federal Republican* was also on Gay Street. Baltimore Directory, 1810.

<sup>25</sup> F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, December 16 [1809].

<sup>26</sup> F. O. 353, 59, Wood to Jackson, December 26, 1809.

<sup>27</sup> F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, December 27 [1809].

<sup>28</sup> F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, January 7, 1810.



nated fatally for the latter, he may therefore continue his communication.”<sup>29</sup> There is no trace in the Jackson papers of any correspondence between Jackson and Hanson at this time; it is possible that Jackson’s friend, referred to in P. B.’s letters, bore the same relation to Jackson that P. B. did to Hanson. On February 9th P. B. wrote to Jackson concerning the printing of a pamphlet.<sup>30</sup> On February 19th the British Consul in Baltimore informed Jackson that “the pamphlets from H [Hanson] were sent on by the mail stage.”<sup>31</sup> In a letter dated March 19th and signed by P. B., Jackson was requested, on his return to England, to arrange for the sending of English newspapers to H.<sup>32</sup> Jackson, addressing his reply directly to Hanson, said, “Yr. letter of the 19th ult. was duly rec’d. . . . Your wish respecting a regular file of newspapers shall be attended to.”<sup>33</sup>

In his negotiations with the American Secretary of State, Jackson insisted that no explanation was owed by the British government to the United States for the disavowal of the Erskine agreement since the American government knew at the time the agreement was entered into that it was contrary to the provisions of Erskine’s instructions. Because Jackson continued to make this assertion after it had been denied by Robert Smith, the American government refused to hold any further communications with him and asked for his recall.

On December 11th, 1809,<sup>34</sup> the first of a series of articles called “Reflections on the recent rupture with the British Min-

<sup>29</sup> F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, January 11, 1810.

<sup>30</sup> F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, February 9, 1810.

<sup>31</sup> F. O. 353, 59, Wood to Jackson, February 19, 1810.

<sup>32</sup> F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, March 19, 1810.

<sup>33</sup> F. O. 353, 60, Jackson to Hanson, April 9, 1810.

<sup>34</sup> In a letter to Timothy Pickering, dated December 11, 1809, Hanson wrote, “The course which I have taken in the Fed. Rep. I trust has met with the approbation of the party generally. I have advanced nothing which the correspondence [between Jackson and Smith] does not bear me out in. . . . If my leisure and health will permit I hope to have finished my reflections on the documents by the end of this week.” *Pickering Manuscripts*, vol. 29, p. 187, Mass. Hist. Society.



ister" appeared in the *Federal Republican*. Among the Jackson papers are a number of documents which are probably the first drafts for these articles. The articles in the *Federal Republican* follow the documents among the Jackson papers with minor changes and some additions. The first of the documents, which corresponds to the last part of the first article called "Reflections" is marked, "sent but not dated 7th Dec. 1809."<sup>35</sup> The other documents are all dated a few days before the corresponding articles appeared in the *Federal Republican*.<sup>36</sup> On December 9th Peter Branson wrote to Jackson, who was in Philadelphia,

Your letter came duly to hand and I only regretted that you limited yourself so much in your remarks. . . . The piece which you propose forwarding will no doubt attract much notice, as the subject is particularly interesting and has not yet been treated of. I had prepared some remarks myself but they shall be either thrown aside or incorporated with those I may receive from you. . . . The sooner I receive your communication the better.<sup>37</sup>

On December 16th P. B. acknowledged the receipt of another letter from Jackson and went on to say,

It is certainly very much in your power to give useful hints upon certain interesting subjects, which it would be equally my wish to convert to a political use. To keep up a brisk and effectual fire upon the great folk near the Potomac a constant supply of ammunition is necessary. A well stored magazine is near me but I need not draw upon the documents when I have a better at my command. You will be kind enough therefore to inform my friend that altho' he has been tolerably industrious so far, he has not answered my expectations so well in quantity as in quality of matter. His observations are so spirited and judicious and have done so much good that they ought not be discontinued until he exhausts the subject. I have

<sup>35</sup> F. O. 353, 57.

<sup>36</sup> The manuscripts in the Jackson papers are dated December 7, 9, 11, 18, 19, 22, 25, 27, January 2, 4, 6, 7. One is not dated. The corresponding articles appeared in the *Federal Republican* on December 11, 13, 15, 27, 29, 30, January 1, 8, 9, 17, 19, and February 5.

<sup>37</sup> F. O. 353, 61, Peter Branson to Jackson, December 9, 1809.

been also asked to put into a pamphlet the remarks headed "Reflections" which you are acquainted with. When they are brought to a close, if they are concluded with the same spirit with which they are commenced, and you think it worth while they shall be circulated in a pamphlet. . . . I could have any number of them conveyed to Washington, there closed and franked by members of Congress and thus sent to all parts of the U. States at cost.<sup>38</sup>

Later P. B. reported,

Your letter of the 20th inst. was not received until this morning. Rely upon it, nothing shall be omitted on my part to counteract the mischievous effects of the late doings at Washington. If you continue of the same mind now that you were when your letter was written, "Reflections" and Gardenier's<sup>39</sup> speech when delivered shall be printed. No doubt is entertained that they will do a vast deal of good. . . . According to my present impressions when I saw you in Philadelphia you seemed to be unwilling to incur an expense of more than two or three hundred dollars. Whether both can be printed for that sum I know not, but if you will only notify me of the amount that will be forthcoming, as many of the pamphlets and speeches shall be printed as will meet the sum mentioned. The sooner I hear from you the better. We should strike, as Coleman<sup>40</sup> says, while the iron is hot.<sup>41</sup>

The discussion of publishing "Reflections" as a pamphlet was continued. P. B. wrote,

<sup>38</sup> F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, December 16 [1809].

<sup>39</sup> Barent Gardenier, Federalist member of Congress from New York. In an earlier letter P. B. had written, "I had a long conversation with Gardenier as he passed through Sanscullotheville. He told me that he had not turned his attention to the documents but had made up his mind if they afforded the materials which I represented, he would resolutely use them with all the effect in his power." F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, December 16 [1809].

<sup>40</sup> Probably William Coleman, editor of the *Evening Post*. In another letter P. B. said that "C——n of New York writes me a flattering account of the public sentiment in that state. The knavery of our great men seems to be properly appreciated there. He thinks that he will be able to wield a club of Hercules that will prostrate into the dust the enemies of correct principles." F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, December 16 [1809].

<sup>41</sup> F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, December 27 [1809].

Yours of the 27th has been received. Let me repeat to you that "Reflections" are doing much good and are much read and talked of. The smallest number which I have concluded to have printed and adopted a plan for distributing is 1,000 400 of which shall be set down to your account, the residue shall be paid for by subscription, or myself. I mean to have at least 500 circulated in this state, because here parties are nearly balanced, and great pains are taken by the other side to lead the people astray by distributing Newspapers, Etc. gratis.<sup>42</sup>

Later Jackson was informed that

The best judges have given the preference to "Reflections" over anything that has appeared on the same subject. Some of my friends in Congress hearing that they were to appear in a pamphlet have ordered 250 of them to be purchased on their acc<sup>t</sup>. . . . Rob<sup>t</sup> LeRoy Livingston and others of New York have taken 100 copies for the purpose of franking and sending to that state.<sup>43</sup>

On February 27th, P. B. wrote,

Every mail is charged with some dozens of the pamphlets. . . . If the author should by any means be known the effect of course would be done away. . . . The secret being imparted to any friend would find its way by degrees to the publick generally. Have you mentioned it to Coleman? I have my reasons for asking.<sup>44</sup>

It is clear from these letters that Jackson either wrote "Reflections on the recent rupture with the British Minister" or that he supplied the information for them to their author.

The articles contained a defense of Jackson from the accusations made against him in the despatch from the Secretary of State, Robert Smith, to William Pinkney, the American Minister in London, directing Pinkney to ask for Jackson's recall. The despatch, dated November 23rd, 1809, was among the documents accompanying Madison's annual message and was communicated to Congress on November 29th.<sup>45</sup> The author

<sup>42</sup> F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, December 29, 1809.

<sup>43</sup> F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, February 9, 1810.

<sup>44</sup> F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, undated. Postmarked Feb. 27.

<sup>45</sup> *American State Papers*, Foreign Relations, vol. III, pp. 319-323.

of "Reflections" objected to the presentation of this despatch to Congress and its subsequent publication in the newspapers, before it could reach Pinkney, as a violation of diplomatic usage. The writer maintained that the publication of the document

can be viewed in no other light than as an appendix to the President's message, written and prematurely exposed to view, for the express purpose of inflaming and misguiding the national legislature. . . . Mr. Madison had too much penetration not to foresee that the decision of the American people would be against their faithless rulers unless the correspondence [between Smith and Jackson] should be accompanied by an insidious and inflammatory appeal to their passions and prejudices. . . . And knowing that the lips of the dismissed minister were hermetically sealed, he resolved to issue the manifesto.<sup>46</sup>

The writer did not mention that, although Jackson's lips were considered hermetically sealed, the use of his pen was not only left to him but even encouraged by those Americans who disapproved of the policy pursued by their government.

In the course of the discussion in "Reflections" the three conditions, which Erskine was instructed by Canning to present to the United States and which had been repudiated by them, were defended as consistent with the honor and interests of the American people. The American government had refused to consider giving permission to the British navy to aid in enforcing the Non-intercourse Act against France; in "Reflections" it was maintained that the English government would have been "the veriest idiots if they had believed that American vessels would have abstained from trading with France when the Non-Intercourse Act as regarded England was removed. They know well enough how far this act is efficacious in regard to themselves to trust its strict observance towards France."<sup>47</sup> On the subject of Great Britain's dis-

<sup>46</sup> *Federal Republican*, December 11, 1809. This paragraph does not appear in the documents among the Jackson papers. It is probably the work of P. B.

<sup>47</sup> *Federal Republican*, December 28, 1809. F. O. 353, 57, document dated 19th December.

avowal of the Erskine agreement, it was said, "We have shown that there could not in reason be any reliance on the part of the British Government, in the spirit of Mr. Smith's communications, and that if England had been simple enough to rely upon appearances, so entirely false and illusory, she would have been grossly deceived."<sup>48</sup>

In respect to Jackson's negotiations with the American government, it was denied that anything in his communications to the Secretary of State could be considered insulting and that therefore no justification for his dismissal existed. It was maintained that any misunderstanding on the part of the American government of the real meaning of Jackson's words should have been removed by the explanation contained in his letter to Robert Smith, in which Jackson said, "In stating these facts. . . . Mr. Jackson could not imagine that offence would be taken at it by the American Government, as most certainly none could be intended on his part." The author of "Reflections" considered that "To a man of honor such an explanation would have been held sufficient, but as our government from the commencement never intended to negotiate, it could not be expected that this opportunity would be improved to effect a reconciliation."<sup>49</sup>

In addition to the aid given by the British Minister in contributing "Reflections" to the *Federal Republican*, he apparently helped the Federalist cause by supplying information on miscellaneous subjects to P. B. Unfortunately there are no drafts of Jackson's answer to P. B's. questions among the Jackson papers, but the questions themselves are interesting. At one time P. B. wrote,

I have received a letter from a friend in Congress requesting me to furnish him with the proof of Erskine's letters being

<sup>48</sup> *Federal Republican*, December 28, 1809. F. O. 353, 57, document dated 22 Dec. In the document among the Jackson papers, the phrase "to rely upon so baseless a Fabric" is used instead of the *Federal Republican* version, "to rely upon appearances so entirely false and illusory."

<sup>49</sup> *Federal Republican*, January 9, 1810.

submitted to Rob<sup>t</sup> Smith for revisal. What shall I answer? Shall I say that the evidence is of a nature not to be used in Congress? It should have at once suggested itself that the proof of a fact of such a nature would necessarily be confined to the parties in the case and that English authority would have no weight with Democrats. Am I not correct in the impression that Mr. Oakley<sup>50</sup> was the only witness? If it be otherwise, and any clerk or indifferent person is privy to the circumstance, be so good as to inform me without delay, that a matter so relevant may be properly employed. . . . If the fact can be substantiated it will be used in debate by a member of Congress.<sup>51</sup>

A letter from Jacob Wagner to Timothy Pickering gives a clue to the kind of report that Jackson had been spreading. Wagner wrote,

There is no question that R. Smith corrected the official letters of Mr. Erskine in the sense you understood. . . . Mr. Oakley is quoted as the witness by Mr. Jackson, who has openly spoken of it in terms of censure and astonishment. Mr. Oakley is mentioned as having been the go-between in the communication. . . . Since the receipt of your letter I have made more particular inquiries from Mr. Hanson and his brother Charles, who affirm what I mention, and that the fact was not imparted to them alone but to several others. If the Demagogues should be able to trace this information up to Mr. J. it might give force to their declaration of his remaining here to intrigue; we have therefore declined publicly disclosing the foundation of the assertion. . . . With respect to the reference in the Fed. Republican to *proof* of Mr. Smith having revised and altered Mr. Erskine's official letters, it may be observed that Mr. Jackson was questioned whether Mr. Oakley would adhere to his communication and he answered, that most undoubtedly he would.<sup>52</sup>

Later P. B. wrote that he had heard a rumor that the Spanish Minister had proposed to the American government,

That if our Government will receive him, immediate and

<sup>50</sup> Charles Oakeley, Secretary of the British Legation.

<sup>51</sup> F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, December 16 [1809].

<sup>52</sup> Pickering Manuscripts, vol. 29, pp. 194-5, Mass. Hist. Society.

ample remuneration will be made for all depredations heretofore committed upon our commerce, and all claim on the part of Spain to Louisiana will be relinquished and the line of demarkation settled according to our pretensions. Eight millions of dollars have been offered as a sum covering all captures. I am also informed this project has been rejected.

If you can by any means get at the truth of this business from Don Onís, It may be handled to great effect. Will you make the attempt and let me hear from you without delay.<sup>53</sup>

In another letter he asked Jackson,

If it be not inconsistent with your duty, will you do me a great service by informing me as early as possible after your despatches arrive of the course to be taken by England. I am particularly interested in knowing what will be done before the intelligence becomes public.<sup>54</sup>

He also asked for information as to

whether any arrangement has been made between the Ministers mentioned [Wellesley and Pinkney] and also whether there is any foundation for the reported change of ministry. We look with anxiety for Mr. Canning's restoration. . . . His accession would be a sort of triumph over Democracy.<sup>55</sup>

That suspicions of the relations of the British Minister with the *Federal Republican* were entertained is demonstrated by a letter from Wood, the British Consul in Baltimore, to Jackson. He wrote, "From some expressions in Wagner's paper, the Demos here are trying to make it out that you correspond with him."<sup>56</sup>

A tribute from Jackson to Alexander Hanson shows what a strong bond hatred of democracy constituted at that time. He wrote,

I shall always remember with pleasure and much interest those who have been my fellow labourers in the vineyard and

<sup>53</sup> F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, February 1 [1810].

<sup>54</sup> F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, February 9, 1810.

<sup>55</sup> F. O. 353, 61, P. B. to Jackson, April 28, 1810.

<sup>56</sup> F. O. 353, 59, Wood to Jackson, March 26, 1810.



in whatever clime I might be transplanted I shall be happy to give them proofs of my unceasing devotion to the same righteous cause, and acquaint them with the progress that shall be made in another Hemisphere. Need I add that under these impressions you will be sure to hear from me.<sup>57</sup>

Jackson made another attempt to influence public opinion in the United States by means of a circular letter which he addressed to the British Consuls. The letter announced Jackson's dismissal by the American government and was dated November 13th. It incorporated Jackson's note to the Secretary of State, also dated November 13th, in which Jackson defended the position he had taken and said that "In stating these facts and in adhering to them, as my duty imperiously enjoined me to do. . . . I could not imagine that offense would be taken at it by the American Government, as most certainly none could be intended on my part."<sup>58</sup>

The Consuls sent characteristic acknowledgments of the circular. Wood wrote from Baltimore on November 14th, "I have received your circular and will do the needful with it."<sup>59</sup> The next day he informed Jackson, "I have shown your letter to Wagner [probably Jacob Wagner, the editor of the *Federal Republican*] and given him some hints which he will take advantage of."<sup>60</sup> Phineas Bond, the Consul General in Philadelphia, took another view of Jackson's method of giving publicity to his side of the quarrel with Robert Smith. He said, "I have received your official letter and private note of the 13th. . . . You are the best judge of the Mode you mean to adopt to correct the public opinion in the present critical state of the public mind."<sup>61</sup> The next day he wrote that the editor of the *Register* (probably of the *Political Register*, a Federalist newspaper published in Philadelphia) had expressed his inten-

<sup>57</sup> F. O. 353, 60, Jackson to Hanson, April 9, 1810.

<sup>58</sup> F. O. 5, 64, enclosure 11 in No. 18, Jackson to Canning, November 15, 1809.

<sup>59</sup> F. O. 353, 59, Wood to Jackson, November 14, 1809.

<sup>60</sup> F. O. 353, 59, Wood to Jackson, November 15, 1809.

<sup>61</sup> F. O. 353, 59, Bond to Jackson, November 15, 1809.



tion of publishing the circular if he could obtain a copy of it. "Perhaps," Bond continued, "You will think the substance of the letter will appear quite seasonably enough and with more propriety when the Correspondence shall be submitted to the View of both Houses of Congress."<sup>62</sup> Thomas Barclay, the Consul General in New York, was even more frank in expressing his opinion. He wrote to Jackson,

In your private note of yesterday you hinted that you hoped the Publick Opinion will be rectified whenever the correspondence between you and Mr. Smith was published, which it would soon be. Whether you alluded to it being published by being laid before Congress by the President, or made public by yourself, I cannot ascertain. If the latter was your intention I hope you will not be offended with me when I beg you to reflect on the propriety of the measure before you carry it into effect.<sup>63</sup>

It is possible that Bond and Barclay remembered the unsuccessful efforts of G net to appeal from the American government to the American people.

Jackson, however, was apparently unmoved by these warnings. On November 18th, L. Beach, who was connected with the *Independent American*, a newspaper published in Georgetown, wrote to Jackson that his circular to the Consuls

is in circulation in manuscript in this town. The Democrats are *astounded*, they know not what to say. If the letter should not come out in the Alexandria paper, as I expect, this morning, I must solicit a correct copy for our next paper as it is now high time it should appear in print, and I shall certainly insert it in our next.<sup>64</sup>

The circular appeared in the *Independent American* on November 21st. Apparently its publication had the effect on Federalist opinion, at least, that Jackson had hoped. According to the *Federal Republican*, the publication of Jackson's explanation,

<sup>62</sup> F. O. 353, 59, Bond to Jackson, November 16, 1809.

<sup>63</sup> F. O. 353, 59, Barclay to Jackson, November 17, 1809.

<sup>64</sup> F. O. 353, 61, Beach to Jackson, November 18, 1809.

has given a new impulse and a different direction to the feelings of our citizens. Connected with the numerous falsehoods published in the Government paper . . . it has convinced the candid and judicious men of all parties that there has been duplicity and foul play on the part of Secretary Smith.<sup>65</sup>

Charles Oakeley wrote to Jackson from Philadelphia, "I am informed it [the circular] has given universal satisfaction to all grades of Federalists and the Democrats are embarrassed."<sup>66</sup> He thought that Phineas Bond was more reconciled to the publication, "from the circumstance of your circular having so far answered your Expectation as to producing a beneficial effect."<sup>67</sup>

The publication of the circular did not remain unnoticed by the American government. In directing Pinkney to ask for Jackson's recall, the Secretary of State gave as one of the reasons for the request, the publication of Jackson's letter to the Consuls. Smith said that "as the paper was at once put into public circulation, it can only be regarded as a virtual address to the American people of a representation previously addressed to their Government, a procedure which cannot fail to be seen in its true light by his sovereign."<sup>68</sup>

On December 11th a debate took place in the House of Representatives on a motion, proposed by Josiah Quincy, that the executive department be asked to present the House with a copy of Jackson's circular. The object of Quincy and the other Federalists who took part in the debate, was to make it clear that, in writing to Pinkney, the executive had acted upon unauthenticated newspaper information and that there was no proof that the published form was a true copy of the letter or that Jackson had written it. In the course of the debate Macon and Eppes stated that the authenticity of the letter could be ascertained by calling upon the printers of the newspapers.<sup>69</sup>

<sup>65</sup> *Federal Republican*, November 28, 1809.

<sup>66</sup> F. O. 353, 59, Oakeley to Jackson (undated).

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>68</sup> *American State Papers*, Foreign Relations, vol. III, p. 322.

<sup>69</sup> *Annals of Congress*, 11th Congress, part I, pp. 707-715.

On December 16th, Beach informed Jackson that

One democrat member told me . . . that they should have to call on me in order to identify the letter and to prove that it was written and published by desire of Mr. Jackson. They may *call* but I shall consider before I *come*. At this moment however, I see no reason against giving them the whole story, but I shall think before I speak.<sup>70</sup>

Jackson answered,

I suppose nothing farther will be said to you about the Circular, nor do I know how you can be forced to declare through what channel you obtained it. There were many copies in circulation in George Town, Philadelphia and N. York, where the publication took place on the same day, if not sooner, as in the *I. American*. . . . It would be most politic to say nothing more about it and I don't suppose even Giles means to thumb-screw you.<sup>71</sup>

Jackson must have felt that his attempt to influence American public opinion, in this instance, was open to criticism because the explanation of the episode which he sent to his own government cannot be considered a candid one. He wrote,

Neither as a Minister, nor as an individual could I submit the Aspersions thus thrown upon my Conduct to remain unnoticed, and I know of no more legitimate manner than a communication to those persons who naturally look to me for Information and support. If my letter got first into circulation and afterwards into print, it was a circumstance, which altho' I did not think myself authorized to make the Publication, I could not regret. It was highly necessary that some Means should be taken to correct the Publick Mind, and that this effect was produced in a very great Degree, is, I believe, the real motive of the Sensibility of the American Government on the subject.<sup>72</sup>

In December 1809, Jackson's expenses for newspaper propaganda had reached the sum of five hundred pounds. He

<sup>70</sup> F. O. 353, 61, Beach to Jackson, December 16th, 1809.

<sup>71</sup> F. O. 353, 61 (unsigned, dated December 20th.)

<sup>72</sup> F. O. 5, 64, No. 23, Jackson to Canning, December 6th, 1809.

thought, however, that although "the service . . . is become, under the recent Turn which Affairs have taken, even more urgent than before, it is right to say that I am not aware that I shall have any further call of this Nature," unless further activity in this direction were thought necessary by the foreign secretary.<sup>73</sup> But a letter which Jackson received from Richard Soderstrom, the Swedish Consul General, shows that he continued his propaganda through the newspapers. Soderstrom wrote early in 1810 of a newspaper communication (which I have been unable to trace), "I am sure that it is written by J. R. yet he has disappointed me much—friday I believe we will have a new one written in our other name."<sup>74</sup> Immediately before his return to England, Jackson informed his government that he had spent another two hundred pounds,<sup>75</sup> making a total of seven hundred pounds for newspaper propaganda during his year of residence in the United States.

---

<sup>73</sup> F. O. 5, 64, Jackson to Bathurst, December 27, 1809.

<sup>74</sup> F. O. 353, 61, Soderstrom to Jackson.

<sup>75</sup> F. O. 353, 60, Jackson to Wellesley, September 15, 1810.

## “PATOWMECK ABOVE YE INHABITANTS.”

A COMMENTARY ON THE SUBJECT OF AN OLD MAP.

By WILLIAM B. MARYE.

---

### PART TWO

- a. Character of the Country: the “howling wilderness”; barrens; “ye Elks licking place.”
  - b. The Tuscarora Indian Town.
  - c. King Opessa’s Town on the “Warriors’ Path.”
  - d. Evidences of Shawnee Settlements in Baltimore County.
- 

#### (a)

When the Hon. Philemon Lloyd, some time in the year 1721, made his map of those parts of the provinces of Maryland and Virginia which lay along the Potomac and its tributaries “beyond ye inhabitants,” the white inhabitants, of course, meaning, that extensive territory was still what most of us would describe as a “howling wilderness.” This wilderness extended to the eastern edges of the Monocacy valley and no white settlers as yet, so far as records show, with the possible exception of a few Indian traders, were living within the confines of that valley. Of Indian towns there were, in that part of this wilderness which was embraced within the province of Maryland, several, of which three were inhabited by Shawnees and one by Tuscaroras. All of these towns were then, as it will presently appear, of more or less recent origin. Of the prehistoric Indian inhabitants of what is now Western Maryland nothing definite seems to be known; and very little, if anything, of a definite nature can be said of those Indians who may have lived in those parts in the five decades which followed the founding of Maryland. This entire region was visited by and more or less lorded over either by Susquehannocks or by the people of the Five Nations. All of these peoples had their homes elsewhere.

At the making of the treaty of Lancaster, June, 1744, the representatives of the Six Nations call to mind their conquest of the Indian tribes which formerly inhabited the Susquehanna, the Cohongoronta (upper Potomac) and "on the Back of the Great Mountains in Virginia," naming separately four tribes, among whom the Conoy or Piscattaways seems to be the only ones which may be identified to a certainty. (*Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania*, Vol. IV, p. 698 et seq.) A well known authority, David I. Bushnell, Jr., is of the opinion that among the other three the Manahoac and Monocan, Siouan peoples which formerly inhabited the Valley of Virginia, may possibly be mentioned. (*Virginia Historical Magazine*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 295 et seq.) Altogether, there appears to be but a slim chance that among these four names we have one of an otherwise unknown Indian people who at one time had their home somewhere on the upper Potomac in what is now the State of Maryland. But why the Conoys or Piscattaways, may we not inquire? These people, so far as we know, were never conquered by the Five Nations. There is no intimation in the Maryland Archives that the Piscattaways, whose chief place of residence in the seventeenth century was on Piscattaway Creek in Maryland, had any close relations living farther west in the provinces of Maryland and Virginia, with whom they had intercourse, or on whom they could draw in time of need. They did not forsake this ancient home of theirs until 1697, when they repaired to the valley of Opequon Creek in Virginia, and it was not until 1699 that they were found on the upper Potomac or Cohongoronta, at the island which, in memory of their residence there, was afterwards known as Conoy Island. I cite this fact, because, as I have shown in my previous article, Philemon Lloyd refers to the Conoys as "a Numerous People weh (which) heretofore Inhabited ye Upper Parts of yt River" (the Potomac). Does he refer to their brief and at that time but recently ended period of residence on Conoy Island, or by "upper parts" does he refer to those parts of the Potomac about Piscattaway? In all

probability he meant one thing or the other; but, of course, there is at least a bare chance that he had reference to a tradition, according to which a large body of these people at one time lived on what we should call the "upper parts" of the Potomac, that is, in what is now Western Maryland or West Virginia. (See article on the Conoy in *Handbook of American Indians*, Bulletin 30, Bureau of American Ethnology, Part 1, page 339, where the possibility that the Conoy once lived on the Kanawha River, in what is now West Virginia, is mentioned.)

To return to the subject of the Monocacy and its valley, the name, as the reader learned from my last article, is Shawnee, according to Lloyd; consequently it is probably of no great antiquity—not much more than two hundred and fifty years old—since it was almost certainly the invention of the inhabitants of the Shawnee towns of the upper Potomac. Lloyd gives us the "Seneca" (the Five Nations) name for this river—*Cheneoow-quoquey*. From Louis Michel we get "Quattaro" (1707) for the stream (*Virginia Historical Magazine*, Vol. XXIX, page 1), and from Baron de Graffenried's Map of the Potomac River, 1712, we get "R. (rivière) de Coturki." (See reprint of this old map in Fairfax Harrison's *Landmarks of Old Prince William*, Vol. 1, at page 265.) These last two names I take to be Indian, although I must admit that to me they have not exactly an "Indian" sound. I hazard the suggestion that one of them may be the Conoy or Piscattaway name for the Monocacy.

The western parts of Maryland were in primitive times crossed by a number of Indian trails, at least three of which were of great length and had their points of origin and destination in other provinces. I refer to the so called "Warriors' Path," to the "Indian Road by the Treaty of Lancaster," so called, and to the old "Conestoga Path" or Road. These Indian paths will be made the subject of another chapter. I have already written at length about one of them, the Conestoga Path (*Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. XV, page 364 et seq.).

The Conestoga Path, to sum up all that seems to be definitely ascertainable regarding it, appears to have originated in the Indian town of Conestoga, the principal habitation of the remnants of the Susquehannock Indians in the eighteenth century. This town was situated on Conestoga Creek in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, some distance below the site of Lancaster. From Conestoga the Indian path proceeded to the Susquehanna, which it crossed somewhere in the neighborhood of the Blue Rock, or so it would seem from the evidence in hand. This place was not far from Washingtonboro and in the immediate neighborhood of the old Susquehannock fort of history. From the west bank of the Susquehanna the Conestoga Path journeyed in a south westerly direction, across what are now the counties of York in Pennsylvania, Carroll and Frederick in Maryland, to the Monocacy River, passing over the headwaters of Codorus and Conewago Creeks and over Great and Little Pipe Creeks. The ford at which it crossed the Monocacy was nearly due east of the site of Frederick. Evidence to prove this point will be presented in another article. From the Monocacy the Conestoga Path went over the mountains in a westerly direction, crossing Katoctin and Antietam Creeks, to a ford on Potomac River below Sherherdstown, which came to be known as the "Old Packhorse Ford" from the fact that it was used by Conestoga traders with their pack-horses, on their way into Virginia along the Conestoga trail. Ultimately the Conestoga Path probably made connection with the "Indian Road by the Treaty of Lancaster."

Something of the essence of the wilderness traversed by the old Conestoga Path and of the life of the white trader on the path emanates from the proceedings of the trial of two brothers named, respectively, John and Edmund Cartlidge, for responsibility in the death of a Seneca Indian. The savage incident, its wild attendant circumstances and its curious wilderness "bouquet" seem all the stranger from the fact that the time of its occurrence, the month of February in the year 1722, was near the very eve of the opening up of the Monocacy valley



to white settlements, after which nothing quite like it could happen again. The Cartlidge brothers lived in the Indian town of Conestoga, from which it would seem, they carried on a trade with Indians of Maryland. The murder caused a great stir among the Indians of those parts and, while it appears to have been committed in self-defence, an investigation was not to be avoided, and, in order to conduct this inquiry, the Hon. James Logan and Colonel John French set out from Philadelphia for Conestoga in March, 1721/2. (*Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania*, Vol. 3, p. 146.) Meanwhile notice of the death "at Monocasey" of "the great Sinicar Indian" had been entered in the Maryland archives (see "The Old Indian Road" by this author, *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. XV, p. 392). Logan and French, on arriving at Conestoga, found John Cartlidge in the sheriff's custody and ascertained that his brother, Edmund, "was then over the River Sasquehannah waiting with a Gang of Horses as we were informed, for his Brother to joyn him to proceed on their business of Trade towards Potowmeck." The trial of John Cartlidge was held at Conestoga on March 14th, 1721/2 (*Ibid.*, p. 148 et seq.). It was testified by Indian witnesses that the murder was committed at "Manakassey, a Branch of Potowmeck River," which I understand to mean at no particular settlement, but somewhere in the Monocacy valley. The dead man was a Seneca Indian named Sawantaeny, "a Warriour, a civil man of few Words." "He was hunting, being used to hunt in that place." "The man had been hunting there alone, with a Squaw that kept his Cabin, til John Cartlidge and his People came thither to trade with him for his Skins." Cartlidge, it appears, had with him besides his brother, Edmund, an Indian guide and two white servants. Two Shawnee "lads" were also present. On their arrival at the Seneca's cabin they (the traders) presented him (the Seneca) with some rum and then began to trade with him, using more rum as their medium of exchange. The trading continued on the following day, when the tragedy occurred as a result of a quarrel over the amount

of rum due to the Indian. The Seneca, it seems, made an attack on one of the Cartlidge brothers, who thereupon hit him a violent blow on the head with his gun, driving the hammer of the gun into his brain, after which the brothers and their servants and Indian guide seem to have departed the scene in haste. The testimony of Weynepreeneyta, the squaw of the murdered man, is moving. She is described as "a Shawnese woman, cousin of Savannah, Chief of the Shawnee nation." She tells how the wounded man staggered into his cabin and how "a great Quantity of Blood came from his wounds, which clotted on the Bear skin on which he lay." The following day he died. "She was alone with the Corps and went to seek some help to Bury him." "In the mean time an Indian Woman, wife to Passalty of Conestogoe, with the Hermaphrodite of the same place, coming thither by accident and finding the Man dead buried him in the Cabin, and were gone from thence before she returned, but she met them in the way and understood by them that they had laid him in the Ground." After her testimony comes that of Passalty's wife and of "the hermaphrodite" (*ibid.*, p. 150), who declare "that Kannannowach, a 'Cayoogoe' Indian, was the first who found the man dead, and that he hired them to go bury him lest the Beasts or Fowls should eat him<sup>1</sup>; that it was about seven Days after his Death that they went thither, for the Body then Stunk." The commissioners, Logan and French, reported, on hearing the testimony, "that the Body of the Indian supposed to be killed had been buried

<sup>1</sup> They not only buried the body but they first prepared it for burial by washing the wounds. The explanation of the fact that the Cayuga man hired them to do this may be that it was not regarded as a man's work. On this point I have sought enlightenment but without definite results. I do find the statement made on good authority, than among Algonquian peoples grave-digging was generally the work of old women (*Handbook of the American Indian*, Vol. I, page 42). Burial of a person in the ground of his cabin was a custom in vogue among some Indian peoples and, apparently, in this case it was done not by whim but according to custom. The situation was complicated, as the deceased was a Seneca (Iroquois) and his wife a Shawnee (Algonquian). The grave-diggers were Susquehannocks or Conestoga (Iroquois).

about six weeks before their arrival at Conestogoe in a solitary uninhabited wilderness, three Days Journey from thence; so that it was not only out of time to have a satisfactory view taken of the same, but also it was impracticable for them to get such a number of Christians to undertake that Journey as would constitute a Jury." (*Ibid.*, p. 153.) This of the Monocacy valley in 1722! John Cartlidge, the accused, was admitted to bail, but his name was struck off the list of justices of Chester County and he was forbidden thereafter to cross the Susquehanna to trade with the Indians. (*Ibid.*, p. 156.) Some months later the two brothers were pardoned at the request of the Five Nations. (*Ibid.*, p. 212.) Edmund Cartlidge removed to Maryland and was one of the pioneers in the settlement of the western part of the colony. He held the office of justice of the peace.<sup>2</sup> One wonders if in after life he was sometimes visited by the memory of that unpleasant incident of the Monocacy wilderness the fate of which he helped to seal.

So much for the wilderness and its ineffable "bouquet." Let us now consider the subject of an almost, if not wholly forgotten feature of this wilderness: the barrens. I have seen it stated in print and on what purported to be good authority, that the whole of what is now Maryland, before the country was developed by Europeans, was covered with a dense forest. Setting aside the fact that the Indian inhabitants, where they had more or less permanent settlements, cultivated a considerable amount of land, I believe this statement as to the former existence of a continuous forest, interrupted only by water courses, to be quite misleading. In my reading of old land certificates I have frequently found mention of "barrens." These "barrens" are generally not described, so that it may be contended that they were lands covered with a scrubby growth of trees and bushes, or were of the nature of the places called "pine bar-

<sup>2</sup> See Court Proceedings, Prince George's County, Md., Liber "S" (1732-March, 1734), folio 504: Edmund Cartlidge recommended to be added to the Commission for the Peace, November court, 1733.

rens " today; and in some cases no doubt such was their character. There is, however, abundant evidence to prove that true "barrens," or what in a qualified sense might have been called "prairies," at one time existed in the eastern parts of what we now call "Western Maryland" and were of very considerable, if not of vast extent. Descriptions of these barrens by witnesses are not wanting.

Captain Richard Brightwell, commander of the rangers stationed at New Scotland on Potomac River (probably at Little Falls), writing in the year 1697 about his explorations of the back country, mentions the fact that he found "barrens backwards" from the river. (*Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. XVI, p. 125, note 31.)

In a letter of October 8th, 1722, The Hon. Philemon Lloyd describes the barrens as follows:

"The Lands next above our Settlements upon the West side of the Susquehannah and all along upon the West side of Baltimore County are cutt off and separated from the Present Inhabited parts by large Barrens, many miles over." Further on in the same letter he again mentions these barrens: ". . . from the Heads of Patapsco, Gunpowder and Bush Rivers over to Monoekasey is a Vast Body of Barrens; that is, what is so called, because there is no wood upon it; besides Vast Quantities of Rocky Barrens." (*Peabody Fund Publications*, No. 34, page 57.)

In the letter-books of Dr. Charles Carroll of Annapolis (1691-1755) we find an undated letter addressed by Carroll to his son Charles, then in London. In this letter we encounter this very striking description of the barrens:

"About thirty miles from the navigable water is a Range of barren dry land without timber about nine miles wide which keeps a course about north east and south west parallel with the mountains thro this province Virginia and Pennsylvania, but between that and the mountains the lands mend and are very good in several parts."

The aspect of the barrens in the upper part of Baltimore

County is well described by several observers in the certificate of survey of a tract of some six hundred and sixty-two acres, which was laid out for James Calder on March 6th, 1771, and called "Castle Calder." This land is situated near Parkton in the Seventh District of Baltimore County. The surveyor's own description of it is as follows:

"There is in this survey about forty acres of poor marsh and about ten acres of scrubby woods and brushy ground, the rest very poor bare Barrens."

"There is a pretty large marsh or glade that might be made into meadow," says John Merryman, who inspected the tract. "The upland (all I saw) was Barrande, hilly and stony, except a few acres."

James Sterett makes allowance for the meadow ground, but adds: "The up land is poore hilly Barranse and much broke with stone and very scarce of timber."

Benjamin Rogers gives the land credit for forty or fifty acres of wet ground, which might be made into meadow, and describes the upland as "exceedingly poor and much broke with stone and little or no timber of any sort."

These barrens were doubtless one of the favorite haunts of the buffalo, which Captain Henry Fleeete (1632) and the unidentified author of "A Relation of Maryland" (1635) mention as indigenous to the country. (Neill's *Founding of Maryland*, p. 27: the *Journal of Henry Fleeete*; *Narratives of Early Maryland*, p. 80: *A Relation of Maryland*.)

The subject of fauna brings us naturally to that of the Elks' Lick. This place, which was situated in Virginia west of Opequon Creek and between that creek and Potomac River, is thus described on Lloyd's map of 1721: "A Salt Soyl called Ye Elks licking place: great droves of those Creatures resorting there to lick ye earth." In that same letter of Dr. Charles Carroll, to which reference was made above, the author refers to such places, to which "the wild creatures as elk, Buffeloes, Deer, wolves and Bears" resort in search of salt: "I have myself seen in divers places Back where the ground hath been eat

away for two or more acres square by the wild creatures as if earth for bricks had been dug in the place in some part two three or four feet deep as the nitrous or aluminious earth lay." (Letter of Dr. Charles Carroll, [1752?], published in this magazine. Taken from his "letter book.")

(b)

*The Tuscarora Indian Town.*

On Philemon Lloyd's map of 1721 the words "ye Tuskarora Indian Town" will be found on that part of the map which represents the angle formed by the west side of Monocacy River at its mouth and the River Potomac. The true site of the town was probably not far from the mouth of a stream still known as Tuscarora Creek, which lies at a distance of about a mile and three-quarters above the mouth of the Monocacy. Another stream of the same name empties into Monocacy River about two miles and a half above Frederick. Both streams have their sources in Catoctin Mountain. Undoubtedly these creeks owe their names to small contemporary settlements of the Tuscarora Indians. I find one of them mentioned in the certificate of survey of a tract of land called "Thicket," which was laid out on January 10th, 1731/32, for Dr. Thomas Craig and John Beal, Sr., in what was then Prince George's County, and is described in part as follows: lying "at the foot of the first ridge of Mountains" (i. e., the Catoctin), "beginning at a bounded hickory and chestnut sapling standing by a small run the westermost branch of Tuskorara Run." On Martinet's map of Frederick County, 1866, the upper creek is called Little Tuscarora Creek and the lower one South Tuscarora Creek.

The unsuccessful wars which the Tuscarora were obliged to wage with the white people of North Carolina (1711-1713), induced large numbers of the tribe to emigrate to the northward, mostly to New York, where eventually they were incorporated with the Five Nations. (See *Handbook of American Indians*, Vol. 2, p. 842 et seq.) The Indian town at the mouth

of Monocacy was unquestionably the home of a band of these emigrant Tuscarora, who tarried there on their way north for a period of several years or longer. It is worthy of note that de Graffenried, who visited that locality in 1712, makes no mention of this town, which probably did not exist at that time. Instead of an Indian town he found a "quartier" or "quarter" of Martin Chartier (he calls him "Charetier"), that picturesque Frenchman and Indian trader, who twenty years before had led a large band of Shawnee Indians across Maryland to a temporary refuge on Bohemia Manor in Cecil County, and whose mistaken identity (he was taken for no less a person than Castine, the one time Governor of Canada) caused a great stir (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. VIII, p. 460). Almost all that is known of this interesting and (for Pennsylvania, at least) historical person is admirably related by Hanna in "The Wilderness Trail"; but Hanna did not know of his trading post at the mouth of Monocacy. (*The Wilderness Trail*, by Charles Augustus Hanna, Vol. I, chapter on the Shawnee Indians.) Colonel Casparus Herman, son of the founder of Bohemia Manor, described his uninvited guest as "a man of Excellent Parts" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. VIII, p. 458). Chartier had lived with these Shawnees at Fort Saint Louis on the Illinois River, and he claimed to have been "with Monsieur de la Salle that Journey that he was killed" (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXIII, p. 500). Eventually (circa 1697) Chartier departed the province of Maryland with his Shawnee friends and with them settled on the east bank of the Susquehanna in Pennsylvania, at Pequea. (*The Wilderness Trail*, Vol. I, p. 160.) De Graffenried met him at the Piscattaway Indian town of Canavest on Conoy Island (now called Heater's Island, near Point of Rocks) in the Potomac River. Apparently Chartier had at this time forsaken Pequea with the intention of taking up a permanent residence at his trading quarter on the Potomac near the mouth of Monocacy, an intention which was not carried out, however. De Graffenried lodged with Chartier and his Indian wife at the trading quarter, where he was re-



galed "after the Indian fashion." (Question: was she that same Indian wife he had with him, when he made his appearance on Bohemia Manor?) Together with Chartier and several Indians de Graffenried ascended Sugar Loaf Mountain, from the top of which they obtained a magnificent view over the wilderness in all directions. (See Publications of the North Carolina Historical Commission: *Baron Christopher von Graffenried's Account of the Founding of New Bern*, pp. 89, 247, 383, 391. See also *Landmarks of Old Prince William*, by Fairfax Harrison, Vol. 1, p. 265: de Graffenried's Map of Potomac River, 1712, on which the site of the "Quartier de Martin Charetier" is indicated.) The fact that Martin Chartier had a trading post at the mouth of Monocacy near the site of the Tuscarora village lends historical interest to the place; and it is, moreover, not beyond the range of possibility that it was Chartier, himself, who induced the Tuscaroras to tarry there and to build a town.

The presence of the Tuscarora Indians in Maryland did not pass unnoticed by the citizens of the province. Their town on Potomac is not only indicated on Lloyd's map of 1721, but it is mentioned by Lloyd in a letter to Lord Baltimore, dated September 10th, 1722. Its situation is described as "near ye Mouth of Monockasey." (Dulaney Papers, Maryland Historical Society, Number 6.) Apparently the Governor of Maryland made a treaty of peace with the Tuscaroras in the year 1719 (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 323, 400, 489). In April, 1720, Philip Thomas of Anne Arundel County made complaint to the House of Burgesses that a servant of his had run away to the Tuscarora Indians, "who refuse to deliver the same." It was ordered "that the said Indians deliver the said servant or shew cause why they detain him contrary to the Treatie of Peace made with them last Assembly (*ibid.*, p. 489). The Indian towns of the western part of Maryland, notably those of the Shawnee, as we shall presently observe, were at that time a famous harbor of refuge for runaway slaves, servants and convicts. This treaty of peace does not seem to have



been considered effective, for in August, 1721, the King of the Tuscaroras and other Indians waited on the governor at Annapolis with a view of making a new treaty "towards a reconciliation of some differences with some of the Inhabitants of Prince George County (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 155). After 1722 we hear no more of the Tuscaroras in Maryland. The growing threat of advancing white settlements no doubt induced them soon afterwards to abandon their town on the Potomac and to proceed northwards to join the main body of their fellow countrymen who had sought asylum there.

(c)

*King Opessa's Town.*

The author of the article on the Shawnee in the *Handbook of American Indians* dates the beginning of the migrations of the Shawnees from their ancient homes in South Carolina from the year 1677 or thereabouts. This migration, we are informed, continued at intervals through a period of thirty years. "The ancient Shawnee villages formerly on the sites of Winchester, Virginia, and Oldtown, near Cumberland, Maryland, were built and occupied probably during this migration." (*Handbook of American Indians*, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 30, part 2, p. 533.) No doubt this is true, although we lack positive proof that Chartier's band, which passed through Maryland in 1692, tarrying until 1697 in Cecil County, and which, as Hanna clearly shows in "The Wilderness Trail," hailed from Fort Saint Louis on the Illinois, did not leave some of its members behind it at these towns, if, indeed, members of the band were not the actual founders of the towns in question. In the month of February, 1697, the plantation of James Stoddert, situated on the Eastern Branch (Anacostia Creek) of Potomac River, was visited by some sixteen Indians, "that live, as I understood them, near the mountains," according to Stoddert's own account. "They had with them Skins and ffurrs which they offered to sell (the which I

bought) when they went away signified by signs that they would come againe at the spring of the year and bring some more Skinnes." (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XIX, p. 522.) The same volume of *Maryland Archives* contains a reference under date of June 1st, 1697, to certain depositions concerning the "mountaine Indians," but the depositions are not recorded therein (*ibid.*, p. 521.) Elsewhere in the Archives we find these Indians referred to as "Strange Indians that are at the head of Potomocke neare the mountains." This designation will be found in the report of a committee on Indian affairs, which bears the same date as the record above referred to. (*Ibid.*, p. 574.) Their relationship to the "Indians which live at the head of the bay" (Shawnees) was suspected, but both were then supposed to be a "scattered people," coming originally from the province of New York. (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXIII, p. 28.) At a conference which was held in the month of May, 1698, between representatives of the Province of Maryland and the kings of the Susquehanock, Delaware and Shavanolet (Shawnee) Indians, the king of the Susquehannocks was charged with responsibility for the "Indians lying back upon the mountaines," but absolutely and, as it would seem, quite truthfully, denied that they belonged to his people. Meauroway, the old king of the Shawnees (i. e., of that band of Shawnees which had settled on Bohemia Manor, and which about this time had taken up their abode at Pequea in Pennsylvania) and Penascoh (Opessa?), his "coadjutant," who probably knew full well who these "mountain Indians," their own relations, were, maintained a discreet silence and were not pressed for information. (*Ibid.*, pp. 427, 430.) At a meeting of the Council held on October 15th, 1697, it was recommended "that a number of men out of each Province (i. e., from Maryland and Virginia) be by consent appointed to go out in the Spring of the year to find out the mountain Indians that are said to be beyond the Piscattaways where they are now seated." (*Ibid.*, p. 234.)<sup>3</sup> The Piscattaways were then living in the

<sup>3</sup> The report of this proposed expedition, if it ever came off, seems to be missing.

valley of Opequon Creek, in Virginia, whither they had recently absconded.

The above cited records are, I believe, the earliest existing references to the Shawnee settlements on the Potomac.<sup>4</sup>

Of these Shawnee towns on Potomac there were certainly two, most probably three. All were deserted before 1738. On John Warner's map of the Northern Neck, 1738, we find "Shanno Indian Fields deserted" on the north bank of the Potomac or Cohongoronta, opposite to the mouth of the Wappacomo or South Branch, that is, on the sight of King Opessa's Town, which about this time began to be known as "Old Town." (*Landmarks of Old Prince William*, Vol. 2, p. 441.) On this same map we find "Shawno Ind.<sup>n</sup> Fields deserted" on the north side of the Cohongoronta, stretching from about the site of Cumberland upwards along the river for a considerable distance.<sup>5</sup>

The "Old Towns" are mentioned in various land records, as follows:

In the certificate of survey of "Indian Seat," laid out for John Charlton November 8th, 1739, in what was then Prince George's County, there is mention of "the Old Town."

In the certificate of survey of "I Never See It," laid out for John Tolson, 1743, in Prince George's County, we find mention of the "Upper Old Town" on Potomac River.

<sup>4</sup> I regret to be obliged to charge with an error of some little importance that generally accurate and excellent work, *The Wilderness Trail*. Hanna has it that the earliest known reference to these Potomac Shawnee is to be found in a record printed in the *Maryland Archives* and dated June 1, 1693; but the record to which he refers bears the date of June 1, 1697, and is to be found in *Maryland Archives*, Vol. XIX, at page 574, and not in Vol. VIII, at page 443, as he has it (see *The Wilderness Trail*, Vol. I, p. 157).

<sup>5</sup> Exactly the same information is found on William Mayo's Map of the Northern Neck, 1737, which is reprinted in *The Wilderness Trail*, Vol. I, opposite to page 156. Fry and Jefferson's Map of Virginia, Maryland and Pennsylvania, 1751, shows "Shawno Fields" on both sides of the Potomac at the mouth of the South Branch or Wappacomo, and "Shawno fields deserted" on the north side of the river above Fort Cumberland.

The description of a tract of land called "Colmore's Ramble," which was surveyed for Colmore Beans on February 28th, 1743/4, runs partly as follows: "beginning at a bounded white oak standing on the side of a hill near the head of a small branch that falleth into Little Cunolloyay's and on the left hand side of the main road that goes from the said Little Cunolloyay's to the Old Town and near where the said Road crosses Cunnollaway's Hill."

The road to Old Town, which is referred to in the above mentioned certificate of survey, had existed at that time for something less than a year, for in the proceedings of the court of Prince George's County for the month of June, 1743, we find the petition of Nicholas Smith and others "ye Inhabitants of Potomack, Andiedom and Conocohego," who call to mind the fact that no public road had as yet been laid out by the court's order "from the ferry near the mouth of Conogoohego to Capt. Thomas Cresops" (i. e., to Old Town), and that the way was "much frequented by Travelers" (there must already have been a path). The petitioners desired that such a road be "cut and cleared" and that Cresap be appointed surveyor to lay out this road. (Prince George's County Court Proceedings, Liber A. A., June, 1742-June, 1743, folio 480.) This petition was granted and the road duly laid out, and so was made a convenient way of access to a place which only twenty-two years before seemed so remote and vague that Philemon Lloyd could describe it in these words: "King Opressa's Town. Some hundred Miles as it is supposed from ye River Cunnat-chique." The actual distance in a straight line is not above forty miles, and the distance by road far less than a hundred.

On November 30th, 1751, Daniel Cresap took up a tract of land called "Little Meadow," of which the following is part of the description found in the certificate of survey: "Beginning at a bounded white oak standing by the side of a small ridge near some sink holes about a quarter of a mile from Potomack River near the Upper old Indian Town." I have not located this tract, but I believe that the Indian town re-

ferred to in this certificate was the one (then, of course, deserted), which stood near the site of the city of Cumberland.

The existence of another "Old Town" and, I believe, undoubtedly, of one of the Shawnee settlements contemporary with King Opessa's Town, is revealed in the certificate of survey of a tract of land called "Choice," which was laid out for Thomas Prather on September 30th, 1747: "beginning at a bounded white oak and hickory standing on the Bank of Potomack River at the upper end of Walker's Bottom about a mile below Sideling Hill and about three miles and a half above the Old Town." The situation of this "Old Town" seems to have been about mid-way between Sideling Hill and Handcock.

In a report, dated September 5th, 1730, concerning the murder of three Indians, Joshua Lowe, coroner of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, mentions "Opessa Towne" and furthermore makes mention of "an old 'Delaware man' named Oppenella belonging to Aungaluta, a towne near Opessa." (*Pennsylvania Archives*, Vol. I, p. 269.) Possibly we have here the name of the Shawnee town near the site of Cumberland. The fact that a Delaware Indian resided there need not deter us in forming this theory, since these Shawnee towns probably tended to be cosmopolitan.

Regarding King Opessa, for whom King Opessa's Town seems to have been named, we know that as king of the Shawnees ("Shavanolls") who were then seated at Pequea in Pennsylvania, he made a treaty with Maryland in the year 1700 (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXV, p. 104). Almost without a doubt he was one of that band of Shawnee which peacefully invaded Maryland in the summer of 1692. Hanna offers evidence that he was one of them when they left Maryland for Pennsylvania about 1697. He made a treaty with William Penn on behalf of his people in 1701. (*The Wilderness Trail*, Vol. I, p. 135.) About 1711, he left Pequea, because, as it was alleged, his subjects "differed with him." (*The Wilderness Trail*, Vol. I, p. 152; *Pennsylvania Archives*, Vol. I, p. 90.) According to Hanna he sought refuge first among the Dela-

wares and later, it is presumed, took up his residence in the town of his people situated at the junction of the north and south branches of Potomac River, to which he gave his name: King Opassa's Town. (*The Wilderness Trail*, Vol. I, p. 152.) He died before July 12th, 1720, for James Logan, Secretary of Pennsylvania, who mentions him in a report of that date, refers to a time anterior to that when "he was then living." (*Pennsylvania Archives*, Vol. I, p. 90.) Opassa seems to have been a man of some character and dignity, if the testimony of certain Seneca witnesses is to be believed. Hanna quotes this testimony in full. (*The Wilderness Trail*, Vol. I, p. 165.) A certain prominent Indian trader, angered by the loss of some runaway servants, offered a reward for the return of the said servants, dead or alive. This proposition was made to some of the young men of the Pequea Shawnee, who were about to start on a hunting expedition; but Opassa, who was present, rebuked the trader for inciting these impressionable youths to murder, "and therefore ordered him to desist, utterly denying his request."

It has already been noted how the Hon. Philemon Lloyd, in a letter dated October 8th, 1722, described Opassa's town as "a large town" of the Shawnee Indians (see *supra*, p. 7). That it was the principal town of the group is hardly to be doubted. About the year 1722, if not earlier, King Opassa's Town became a place of refuge for runaway slaves who succeeded in escaping from the plantations of Maryland and Virginia. Governor Spottswood of Virginia offered a reward of a gun and two blankets apiece to every Indian who should deliver one such runaway at the Plantation of Colonel Mason on Potomac River. (*Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania*, Vol. III, p. 220 et seq.; *Archives of Maryland*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 353 et seq.) Even more concern over this state of affairs seems to have been felt in Maryland and divers efforts were made to get in touch with the Indians of Opassa's Town, who proved to be wary and evasive. On November 1st, 1722, the Governor sent for the Indian traders who were then to be found at Annapolis,

to confer with them about the matter of the "Shawan" Indians (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 379). The following day he appointed Charles Anderson, one of these traders, to repair to the principal Shawnee town on Potomac, in order to treat with the Indians of that place over the return of negro slaves "who for some time past have been entertained at their Towns on Potomac River." He was instructed to seek out Pokaseta and Oneakooopa, chiefs of these Indians, and to present them each with a pair of silk stockings and a "stroud matchcoat," in order to facilitate the negotiations. (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXV, p. 394.) What came of this visit I have not been able to ascertain; but three years later the question of the runaway slaves who were being harbored in these Shawnee towns, was still a sore point with Maryland planters who lived along the frontier. It came up before the Council on May 20th, 1725, and John Powell, gent., was thereupon appointed to go forthwith to the "Shuano Town on Potomack commonly called Opossas Town" in order to invite some of the principal Indians of that town to meet the Governor at the house of Charles Anderson "near Mononknisea" (Monocacy). He was to be provided with an interpreter and with a guide. (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXV, p. 443.) The Indians apparently made the desired appointment, but failed to keep it. On July 14th of the same year Governor Calvert sent Israel Friend, an Indian trader, to the "Shuano Indians on Potomack," to express regrets that they had not seen fit to keep their former appointment, and to appoint a meeting for the 5th of October following at Annapolis. (*Ibid.*, p. 451.) The Governor was evidently determined to establish contact with these Indians, but his dignity did not allow him to make another long expedition to a rendez-vous which might not be kept by them. It appears that he, together with some members of the Council and "several other gentlemen," had journeyed "as far as the mountains to meet the Indians, but they never came." (*Maryland Archives*, Vol. XXXV, p. 301.) Again, in July, 1726, the question of the "Sundry slaves" who had escaped to



the "Shuano Town," came up and seems to have been complicated by the question of the convicts, who were following their example. (*Ibid.*, p. 505.)

Hanna, in *The Wilderness Trail*, presents evidence to prove that the Shawnees abandoned their Potomac towns before 1732 (*The Wilderness Trail*, Vol. I, p. 165). Silence and solitude, broken occasionally by the arrival of war parties travelling along the Warriors' Path, took possession of the site of Opessa's Town, the "Indian fields deserted" grew up in thickets of sassafras bushes, locust saplings and scrub pines, and on the Maryland frontier, which was always pressing nearer, the place became known as "Old Town." At last, more than a decade after the Indians had left the spot, Captain Thomas Cresap, with an eye to the possibilities of trade with the war parties of the Five Nations, settled there—the first white settler of those parts.

(d)

*Evidences of Shawnee Settlements in Baltimore County.*

These evidences are far from being conclusive, being based largely on place and tract names; but, as the saying goes, I still think there is "something in them." First of all we find that, when that part of Baltimore County was first settled, the stream now known as Oregon Run bore the name of the Shawan Cabin Branch. This "run" was known as Shawan Run as late as the first part of the past century, and it was not until a couple of generations ago that it acquired its present name. It rises near a village called Shawan and empties into Beaver Dam Run near Cockeysville. I am not of the opinion that Shawan was so named because it lies on the site of a Shawnee town. I think it was named for the "branch" or "run" at the head of which it lies. But if there is anything in the theory that the Shawnee once had a settlement in this vicinity, the name of the place, Shawan, serves to commemorate the fact. A considerable part of the valley of Shawan Cabin Branch, or Oregon Run, was taken up in an original tract of land called



"The Shawan Hunting Ground." At the head of Oregon Run lies another original tract, "Sepus's Town." This name is, perhaps, suggestive of a bare possibility that the Indian town, if any there was, was situated here, and that "Sepus" was the name of the head man of the place. Between Shawan and Cockeysville there were formerly located some fields called "The Indian Old Fields." These "Indian Old Fields," in so far as I have been able to determine, were within the watershed of Oregon Run at a distance of about two miles or something less, from Shawan. Between four and five miles south east of Shawan are the headquarters of Rowland's Run, which flows past Riderwood and Ruxton and originally discharged into Jone's Falls, but now empties into Lake Rowland, to which it has given its name. This run heads up in two branches, one of which rises at Timonium, the other about a mile and a half west of that place. When this part of Baltimore County was first opened to settlement, one of these head Branches of Rowlands Run was called the Shawan or Shenese Glade.

The theory which suggests itself to me is that these names are due to small settlements of the Shawnee Indians, which the first white settlers discovered at the head of Rowland's Run and on Oregon Run, in Baltimore County. The Indian old fields were the abandoned fields of these people. There is no reason whatever to suppose that their settlements were very ancient, when first discovered. On the contrary, it seems to me entirely probable, granted that they ever existed, that these Indian villages or camps were founded by dissatisfied or by simply weary members of Martin Chartier's band of Shawnees, which, as we have already called to mind, appeared in Cecil County, Maryland, in the summer of 1692. By what route they arrived at their destination is not certainly known, and it cannot be said definitely that they did not come down into Maryland from Pennsylvania. Our supposition is linked with the theory that the Shawnee towns of the Potomac were built by members of this band, after which the more restless ones moved on to the eastward.

The following land records relate to "Shawan Hunting Ground," the Shawan Cabin Branch, the Indian Old Fields, the Shawan Glade, etc.:

Thomas Todd's certificate, 1500 acres, "The Shewan Hunting Ground," surveyed August 11th, 1714, "lying in Baltimore County in the woods betwixt the falls of Patapsco and the falls of Gunpowder River, beginning at three bounded white oaks and a bounded black oak standing on a narrow point betwixt two springs on the north side of a branch called the Shewan Cabin Branch, the said branch being a branch of Gunpowder River." (From the certificate of survey filed at the Land Office, Annapolis, Md.)

John Price's certificate, 250 acres, "Sepus's Town," surveyed December 23rd 1720, beginning at the beginning trees of the land surveyed for Mr. Thomas Todd " (meaning "The Shewan Hunting Ground"). This land was resurveyed for John Price in 1770 under the name of "Sepus's Town Enlarged" and included two other original tracts, "Pleasant Ridge" and "Price's Reserve." "Pleasant Ridge," surveyed for Mordecai Price, lies at the head of Deadman's Run. These facts tend to locate "Sepus's Town" at the head of Oregon Run (Shawan Cabin Branch). These notes from certificates of survey filed at the Land Office.

Plat Book No. 3, Plat No. 37, Towson, Md. Plat of "Shawan Farm," belonging to the Worthington heirs. Lies on Shawan Road and on Shawan Run (Oregon Run).

March 7th, 1737: house built on west side of Gunpowder Falls on a run called the Shawwan Cabbin branch on a tract belonging to John and Thomas Colegate (i. e., "John and Thomas's Forest") recorded as meeting house for Quakers. (Note: I have been unable to find my reference for this record. My impression is that I copied this note from the Baltimore County Court Proceedings of the above date). Hopkins' Atlas of Baltimore County, 1877, shows Friends Meeting House on Oregon Run between Oregon and Cockeysville.

"John and Thomas's Forest," 1687 acres, surveyed for Richard Colegate April 20th, 1720, "on ye south side of ye main falls of Gunpowder River, beginning at three bounded white oaks and a bounded black gum on a narrow point between two springs on ye north side of a branch called The Shawan Cabin Branch descending into ye said ffalls, be said bounded trees being ye first boundaries of ye lands of Thomas Todd called the Shawan Hunting Ground. (Copied from certificate of survey filed at the Land Office.)

"Long Tract," 150 acres, surveyed for John Price, March 20th, 1720, lying on the south side of the main falls of Gunpowder River and on a branch called Showan Cabin Branch, beginning at the beginning trees of a parcel of land surveyed for Thomas Todd (i. e., "The Shawan Hunting Ground"). Reference: same as above.

"Nicholson's Manor," 4200 acres, surveyed for William Nicholson June 20th, 1719, lying in Baltimore County, beginning at four bounded white

oaks standing eight perches distant from a large spring called the Salt Spring descending into the Western Run of Gunpowder between a branch called the Shawan Cabin branch and a branch called Water Spout Branch. (Same reference as above.)

"Price's Good Luck," 20 acres, surveyed for Stephen Price September 29th, 1760, lying in Baltimore County in the Reserve, "beginning at a bounded hickory tree standing by the Indian Old Fields." (Land Office, Annapolis, Md., Unpatented Certificate No. 1309, Baltimore County.)

"Price's Chance," surveyed for Stephen Price January 8th, 1774, 38 acres, being a resurvey on twenty acres of leased land called "Price's Good Luck," originally, September 29th, 1760 laid out for the said Price; beginning for the resurvey at the beginning tree of the aforesaid leased land, being a bounded hickory tree standing by the Indian Old fields." (Copied from the certificate of survey filed at the Land Office, Annapolis, Md.)

"Long Look," 150 acres, surveyed for Stephen Price, February 14th, 1724/5, lying on the south side of the main falls of Gunpowder River, beginning at two bounded hickories standing in the fork of a small branch descending into a branch called Shawan Cabin Branch." (Same reference as foregoing.)

"Long Look," 104½ acres, surveyed for Stephen Price, May 15, 1795, composed of two original tracts of land, namely, "Long Look," originally, October 13th, 1729, granted to said Price for 150 acres, and "Price's Chance," 38 acres, originally, March 18, 1774, granted to said Price. The surveyor finds that two acres and eighteen perches of the original "Long Look" lie in an elder survey called "Jerah" (meaning "Gerar," surveyed for Thomas Hooker August 29, 1715, on Beaverdam Run. This was lately a Merryman place and lies near Cockeysville). The surveyor further finds that 103½ acres of the original "Long Look" lie in an elder survey called "Nicholson's Manor."

"Port Mareen," 123 acres, surveyed for Thomas Carr, December 22, 1714, "lying in Baltimore County in the woods on the north side of a river called Patapsco and on a run called Rowlands Runn and on the north side of a hill called Setter Hill, beginning at a bounded red oak standing on the west side of a glade descending into the aforesaid run called Rowlands Run called Showan Glade." (Copied from the certificate filed at the Land Office, Annapolis, Md.)

"Pearces ffolley," surveyed for William Pearce, July 16, 1716, "lying in Baltimore County in the woods betwixt Patapsco falls and Gunpowder falls and nigh a tract of land called Chesley" (meaning "Selsed," surveyed for Rowland Thornbury), "beginning at a bounded red oak standing by a glade called by the (name of) Shawan glade." (Same reference as foregoing.)

"Hunter's Purchase," 100 acres, surveyed for Thomas Carr, July 30, 1718, lying in Baltimore County, "beginning at a bounded red oak of the land called Port Mareen and three bounded hickories standing on the west

side of a meadow called Shawan Meadow descending into a run called Rowlands Run." (Same reference as foregoing.)

"The Regulation," surveyed for Thomas Carr, September 1, 1744. Resurvey on "Port Mareen" and "Hunter's Purchase." Mention of the "Shawan Glade." (Land Office, Annapolis, Md., Patents, Liber L. G. No. E., folio 534.)

Thomas Ford's land commission on a tract of land called "Selsed," situated in Baltimore County. Depositions taken February 13, 1762. Richard Hooker deposes that thirty years before John Boring told him that the fourth tree of "Selsed" should stand "in a purcoson (swamp) near the Shenese Glade." Absalom Barney deposes that William Welsh told him the fourth tree of "Selsed" stood "in or near the Shenese Glade." (Baltimore County Court Proceedings, Land Commissions, Liber H. W. S. No. 4, folio 329 et seq. This valuable book has been missing from the office of the Superior Court Clerk in the Baltimore Court House for the past six years and can not now be located.)

"July 31, 1699, surveyed for Rowland Thornbury, Selsed, on the north west branch of Jones Falls—900 acres. Resurveyed Oct., 1747, for William Cockey by Thomas White; but Selsed as settled is limited as follows, beginning as above at a bounded white oak by the north west branch of Jones Falls and runs south eighty-nine degrees west two hundred and eighty-five perches to the 2nd boundary of Selsed, north twenty-six degrees west one hundred and ninety-five perches to a bounded maple the 3rd boundary of Selsed, north seventeen and one fourth degrees west sixty eight perches, north north east fifty perches, north east twenty eight perches, east two hundred and forty four perches, north one hundred and ninety perches east ninety four perches east south east one hundred and five perches to a swampy glade more seven perches across the glade more ten perches to a mark more one hundred and twenty eight perches to the west side of Shawan Glade more twenty four perches across this glade more forty four perches, then south twelve degrees east four perches to a small white oak being near where stood the 4th boundary of Selsed as now proved by sundry evidences," etc., etc. (From a manuscript in the possession of the Maryland Historical Society, which formerly belonged to Barrister Carroll and is styled "Collection of Land Certificates chiefly in Baltimore and Anne Arundell Counties, to which is added a List of Postponed Certificates from the years 1703 to 1734." This resurvey contained 1577 acres. So far as I can determine, "Selsed" lies above Riderwood. It lies on Rowland's Run, the name of which is derived from Rowland Thornbury.

(To be Continued.)

## THE BALTIMORE CLIPPER AND THE STORY OF AN OLD BALTIMORE SHIPBUILDER.

By JAMES E. HANCOCK.

---

"Should you ask me whence these stories  
Whence these legends and traditions—  
I should answer, I should tell you—  
I repeat them as I heard them."

This abstract from the prologue to *Hiawatha* fittingly expresses the purpose of this paper to record certain data, including the recollection of things that were told to me by retired sea captains who knew the maritime traditions of old Baltimore and who had sailed Baltimore Clippers and clipper ships from polar sea to polar sea and to the antipodes. In developing the matter, however, it has seemed worth while to describe certain phases in the evolution of boats, whose story goes back to the time when primitive men first found that they could transport themselves by water and then found that they could use poles and paddles to control their crude floats. Later they found that they could make use of the force of wind to help them on their journeys and that this happened at an early period is evidenced by sculptured remains on the tombs of ancient Egypt of vessels equipped with a simple rectangular sail of papyrus or cloth that was suspended from a pole.

The early Phoenicians probably learned of the sail from the Egyptians, and from them in turn, its use was observed by the Greeks and the Romans as they emerged from barbarism. These early peoples along the Mediterranean were the noted traders of antiquity and, for cargo purposes, their boats were quite broad in proportion to their length. These clumsy tubs were propelled by sweeps or oars and were captained by their merchant owners, who gradually found that they could get some force from the wind when it was not directly astern, by tilting the sail; and we see by their early art that the sails were assuming a rhomboidal shape because they could be handled more

easily by a small crew than the square sail. Eventually this became the lateen rig of the Mediterranean, but when commercial wars broke out between the Greeks and the Phoenicians and later between the Romans and the Carthagenians, these nations began to build galleys that were narrower than their trading boats, so that they could be maneuvered more quickly in combat, by the rowers.

These galleys had castellated bows and sterns from which the soldiers fought while the rowers were banked in tiers, four and five deep, amidship; but when Rome began to extend its dominions along the Atlantic, her traders who traveled to Britain and elsewhere soon found that the galley, with its shallow draught and lofty superstructure was unsafe on the high seas and that the square sail was better than the lateen rig for ocean work. Consequently their trading vessels, while retaining the high forecastle and sterncastle of the galley, were built of broader beam and this type was used by the Vikings and others along the Atlantic for the thousand or more years that followed.

In the breakdown of the Roman Empire, Venice and Genoa had succeeded to its commerce in the Mediterranean, and when the Turks took Constantinople in 1453 and disrupted the caravan routes from the East upon which these factors depended, the influence of Venice and Genoa was diminished; but not before Genoa had developed a vessel that could be propelled by sails alone. Previously the sail had been but an auxiliary to the oarsmen, and when there was no longer any need for man power, the high walled sides that contained the rowers benches were cut down in the waist, leaving the high forecastle and sterncastle as a protection against the waves and as an emplacement for the cannon that had come into use. This accentuated the awkwardness of the vessel with its wide rounded bottom, and when they began to build longer hulls and needed more sail for these larger vessels, they placed a square sprit sail in the bow and later rigged a lateen sail to a mizzenmast. Such was the type that was commonly used by the maritime people of Europe when the Portuguese rounded the Cape of Good Hope and Co-

lumbus discovered America, and in these bluff bowed ships with big sheer and a high stern—The Caravel—the early colonists came to America. These ships were fairly staunch, with considerable cargo space but there was so much water resistance at the bow with a corresponding drag aft, that they could not make much speed; yet this broad beamed and lumbering type of hull with slight modification persisted until after the Baltimore Clipper had come into its own.

With the opening of these new trade routes to India and America, the Dutch had largely succeeded to the trade of the Hanseatic league and when the commerce of Spain broke down because of its many wars, Holland took over most of her trade; and, by 1609, when the Netherlands obtained its independence from Spain, Amsterdam had become the greatest maritime centre of the world. Here along the North Sea, where every cloud that crossed the sun raised a breeze that disturbed the water, the Dutch had been developing a triangular sail that was different from both the lateen rig of the Mediterranean and the square sail of the Caravel and the merchants of the Netherlands found that these sails were well adapted for their small vessels on the rivers and canals that threaded the land. For open sea work, however, they still held to the big bellied square sailed ships like the *Half Moon* in which Henry Hudson explored the American Coast and established a colony at New Amsterdam. Knowing the utility of the fore and aft riggers to which they were accustomed, these Dutch settlers, in 1615, built a little sloop of 16 tons for trading with the Indians. In this they explored the New England Coast and the Delaware Bay, and later this little sloop was loaded with furs and sailed across the broad Atlantic to Holland. Although the Dutch were dispossessed of their colonies in what is now New York, New Jersey and Delaware in 1664, their sloops had found favor with the colonists in New England and on the Chesapeake, who adopted it as a superior rig for their waters. In 1713 the first schooner was launched at Gloucester, Mass., and this direct evolution from the single masted sloop was brought about by



moving the foremast further up into the bow when the hull was lengthened and extending the boom to take care of the jibsail. The hull, however, still remained bluff bowed and stiff-kneed and was heavily timbered so that the vessel could buffet the waves and ride out the gales while the men were fishing on the banks.

But along the Chesapeake, the needs were different. Here was an inland sea with tide water tributaries, whose shore line was nearly 3000 miles long. The prevailing winds were not only more equable, but life in Maryland was not as vigorous as it was in New England, and the planters who had settled along the bay front and on the rivers that flowed into the Chesapeake led more leisurely lives. They used boats for social purposes as well as to carry their tobacco and grain to the wharves where the ocean going vessels lay and very naturally the rivers and creeks were more agreeable thoroughfares than the muddy and rutty roads that ran behind the waterways. Almost every plantation of any size had its blacksmith and its carpenter and, with plenty of labor, the planters along the rivers built their sloops as fancy dictated. Many of these craft, it is true, were small open boats, but the men along the Chesapeake were boat conscious and they built into them their own conceits; and when they found that a small boat with certain features could sail faster than their neighbors, they would build its details into a decked 45 or 50 footer. Naturally, some men proved more adept than others and fitted up small yards on the many coves and creeks that ran into these rivers, and not needing vessels that had to buffet high waves, the lighter hulls of the Chesapeake gradually took on more graceful lines, whose bows cut through the water instead of bucking it. Although their low freeboard made them wet ships, nevertheless, during the French and Indian wars when England was fighting France and Spain on the ocean, many of these Chesapeake Bay craft, rigged as sloops, brigs or little two-masted schooners were sent to the West Indies with foodstuffs and materials that the islanders could not obtain from their mother countries and brought



back sugar, molasses, cotton and other supplies that our colonists needed, or for reshipment to England. Very generally these vessels carried one or more guns and service on these armed merchantmen was the practical school for the large number of Baltimore privateersmen during the Revolution that followed.

Differing from almost every other port along the coast at that time, Baltimore had an abundance of timber and iron which were the two essentials for shipbuilding; while cotton for sails could be gotten in trade with the West Indies. When the Revolutionary War broke out and Congress needed ships, the first vessels for the continental navy were not only equipped and manned in Baltimore but Maryland supplemented the Continental Navy with a state navy of its own composed of twenty-five armed vessels, for local protection. On March 23rd, 1776, Congress also authorized the use of privateers and Baltimore sent out about 250 of these privately armed vessels that captured guns, ammunition and other supplies which helped to keep the army in the field. These Chesapeake Bay craft were often referred to in our local maritime history as of pilot boat construction and they evidently made an impression on the officers who served with the French fleet during the siege of Yorktown, because the sailing ability of the *Bateau d'Amerique*, as they called our sloops, was favorably compared in a French naval report of 1783, with that of the English revenue cutters, which kept inside the English and Irish Channels while our sloops sailed the high seas.

In reaction to the revolution, the American people were seemingly prosperous for a year or so after the war and then they awoke to the reality that they had not won that independence which had really induced them to fight. The Treaty of Peace practically confined the commerce of the United States to its own territory and in consequence the farmers were producing more than the people could consume. Continental money was worthless and what coin the merchants had been able to save was soon exhausted by purchases of needed materials abroad. This brought on the depression of 1785 that culminated in the

panic of 1791; and while the rest of the country suffered severely, Baltimore was favored by particular circumstances. In 1780, Congress had agreed to feed the Spanish forces in the West Indies and Maryland flour and grain was selected as an important item in this work. Shortly afterwards, the British began their campaign in the south and with Charleston and other ports along the southern coast in possession of the enemy or under their surveillance, Baltimore became the centre of supplies for the West Indies. Because of the cargoes of raw sugar that were brought back to this port, a sugar refinery was built in Baltimore, in 1784, and when commerce was reestablished with Europe, this sugar supplemented the exports of Maryland tobacco, grain and flour. In this way Baltimore became an entrepot between the West Indies and Europe, and by 1800, our merchants dominated the trade with the islands. In the meantime the French Revolution had occurred and in the European wars that followed, the shipping of the United States was the only neutral commerce that was left on the Atlantic and demands for Baltimore supplies and foodstuffs were heavily increased.

In those days the usual overseas merchantmen averaged 200 tons burthen or less and as these Chesapeake sloops were developed into schooners, so the schooners became the immediate predecessors of the Baltimore Clippers, whose origin is commonly attributed by those who do not know the maritime history of Baltimore, to the presumed visits of French luggers to this port. Personally I doubt that any of these French luggers came to Baltimore during our post revolutionary period, and my tradition of this French influence on the evolution of the Baltimore Clipper is as follows:

Joseph Despeaux was born at Barbas, on the shores of the Garonne, above Bordeaux, in 1758, and after serving as a volunteer officer of marine in the French navy he became a partner, in 1784, of Jean David, who operated a shipyard at Cap Français, San Domingo. David died in 1787, and Despeaux purchased the remaining interest in what was practically the repair

station of the French fleet in western waters. When the San Domingo revolution occurred and the blacks began to massacre the whites at Cap François, Joseph Despeaux, with his wife and two infant sons and nine slaves—eight men and one woman—put out to sea in the yard boat, where they were picked up by an English brig and landed in Philadelphia, July 9th, 1793. There being a law against slavery in Philadelphia, Despeaux took counsel with Stephen Girard, whom he had known as a boy on the banks of the Garonne, and was advised to go to Baltimore in order to keep his party together until they could return to Cap François, where Despeaux had left four ships on the ways besides other valuable property. Fortunately, Despeaux carried considerable gold coin in his money belt with which he was able to establish a shipyard on Philpot Street. This yard fronted one hundred and eighty feet and had over 500 feet of platform and wharfway and, as his men slaves were all shipwrights, he was soon at work building vessels. Being a Frenchman there is no doubt that he was influenced by the policies of Minister Genet because I find among his papers a notice from Lt. Samuel Grove, executive officer of the *H. M. S. Roebuck*, dated December 20th, 1794, advising him that the *Sans Culotte* had been captured by the *Zebra* and was being sent to England and that Jacques Brun, the prizemaster of this French privateer, had that day died of his wounds. Tradition has it that the *Sans Culotte* was outfitted by Despeaux, and as the United States was on the verge of war with Great Britain at the time, American sympathy for France was very keen.

Familiar with the improvements in French naval structure, Despeaux also knew the utility of raking masts and lug sails, and feeling the need of his native country in its war with England, he fitted his knowledge to the trim hull work that prevailed around Baltimore and began to build blockade runners to French ports. Deepening the hold for additional cargo space, he noticed that this increased deadrise gave an extra leverage for sail strain. Other shipbuilders saw the advantage of his innovations and thus the sloop-rigged Chesapeake pilot boat with its low freeboard was progressively developed into the

typical Baltimore Clipper—a two-masted schooner with close fitting sails, carrying a square topsail on her foremast. The Baltimore Clippers were usually supplied with long oars or sweeps to help the crew to maneuver them in luffing or when in a difficult position and very naturally some of these craft were rigged as brigs or brigantines, which were popular types of the period. The great deadrise of their lean low hulls, broad beamed above the water line forward of the centre but sharp in the bow and deep aft, permitted them to carry a large area of canvas on their light and long raking masts, without drifting. Their ability to sail close to the wind made them the swift sea hornets that stung British commerce so viciously during the War of 1812 and before that war was over many Baltimore Clippers were carrying double topsails to increase their speed in light weather and to help them escape when too closely chased. Although at a later period, Baltimore Clippers were sometimes dangerously overrigged with top gallants and royals, their general ability gained them a reputation for speed that did more than anything else to reform the centuries old stereotyped lines of vessels throughout the world.

In 1810 Despeaux built the ship *Alexander* which made several successful voyages to France under the command of Captain Wilson Jacobs, who afterwards commanded the famous privateer *Kemp* out of Baltimore. On May 23rd, 1812, the *Alexander* left Bordeaux for her return voyage but was chased by the British and had to put into Boston. War between the United States and Great Britain was declared on June 18th and on August 4th the cargo of the *Alexander* was auctioned at the Long Room India Wharf and the vessel was advertised for sale as follows: "The said ship *Alexander*, with all of her appurtenances, as she came from sea—103 feet long on deck, 28½ feet beam, about 309 tons burthen, well calculated for a Privateer or a Letter of Marque, built in Baltimore twenty two months since and is presumed will sail equal to any vessel out of the United States—coppered and copper fastened and armed with Guns, Blunderbusses, Pistols, Boarding Pikes, etc." Other arrangements were made, however, and Salem parties took a

4/5 interest while Despeaux retained a 1/5 interest in her. The terms for her privateering was one-half to the owners and one-half to the crew, and on October 3rd, the *Alexander* was reregistered at Salem and sailed under the command of Captain Benjamin Crowninshield. The *Alexander* carried an armament of 18 guns and was manned by a crew of one hundred and twenty and probably her most interesting exploit was the capture in the English Channel of the *Invincible Napoleon*, a French privateer that had been previously captured by the British. The *Invincible Napoleon* was manned by a prize crew and sent to America, but she was recaptured by two British frigates off Cape Ann as she was trying to make port but she was again taken from the British at sea by an American privateer.

The *Alexander* captured seven prizes on her last cruise but was chased ashore in Wells Bay, May 20th, 1813, by two British men-of-war—the *Rattler* and the *Bream*—who recaptured over a hundred prisoners that the *Alexander* had taken. The *Alexander* was afterwards refloated by the British and sent into Halifax but I am sure that, if her crew had not been depleted by the withdrawals that were needed to man her prizes, she would have escaped the enemy and continued her interesting career. Unfortunately the *Alexander* is credited in Navy Annals to Salem because she sailed as a privateer from that port, but she was built in Baltimore, and I am sorry to say that her model that used to hang above the door of the Seamen's Bethel when I was a boy has disappeared.

As I remember this model it had the clipper lines but was ship rigged, and I was often taken to look at her by old sea captains who had sailed Baltimore Clippers and clipper ships and who told me that she was the first clipper ship that was ever built. Despeaux also built and owned the schooners *Freemason*, *The Joseph*, *The Panama*, the brigs *Frances Ursula*, *The Mary Ann* and the ship *Father and Son*—a sister ship of the *Alexander*—and was part owner of several others, including the privateer *Caroline*, out of Baltimore. The record shows further that the *Father and Son* was commissioned as a priva-

teer, February 11th, 1813, under Captain Wilson Jacobs, who had previously commanded the *Alexander* and that this clipper ship was driven ashore in a gale off Havre, December 15th, 1816, and was a total loss.

A copy of Vattel's Law of Nations (1805) bears witness to Despeaux's widespread interests and that he kept contact with things abroad is evidenced by a copy of the *Almanach re La Cour de France* for 1811, which contains the names of the civil and military dignitaries of Napoleon's Court, including that of a cousin, General Despeaux, Commandant of the 20th Division of the French Army with headquarters at Perigueux. Other records reveal the fact that the frigate *L'Poursivante*, Admiral Willaumez, under whom Jerome Bonaparte served, and also the French frigate which loaned the 42-inch guns that kept the British fleet at a respectable distance during the bombardment of Fort McHenry, were docked at Despeaux's Wharf; and that Joseph Despeaux with his sons John and Elie served in the marine artillery that manned these guns in the water battery of the fort. The yard journal also shows that during the War of 1812 *The Wasp*, *The Asp*, *The Ontario*, *The Rover*, *The Ranger*, *The Non Such*, and a number of gunboats of the blue and white squadrons were in Despeaux's yard to be outfitted or repaired, and an interesting feature concerning these gunboats is that they were distinguished by numbers instead of by names, a practice that was revived in more recent years for the smaller vessels in the U. S. Navy.

Joseph Despeaux's death in 1820 was followed by that of his son John in 1826, and although the business was continued by Joseph's widow, the real genius was gone and it was finally sold to Abrahams and Cooper, May 4th, 1844, who turned out more of the well reputed clipper ships of the succeeding period than any other yard in Baltimore. These clipper ships were larger than the Baltimore Clippers but, as in the case of the *Alexander*, they were built by placing the square ship rig on clipper hulls and later these clipper ships increased the number of their masts to four and more. I also have the record of the *Ferrata* that was outfitted in 1827 and which was said to be

the first three-masted schooner in the world and it is interesting to think that the greater tonnage of these larger vessels played an important part in meeting the demands of a heavily increased foreign trade that followed. During the 1840's and 50's the merchant marine of the United States rivaled that of Great Britain and about three-quarters of our commerce was carried in American bottoms; but the Civil War definitely checked the growth of American shipbuilding and after the war was over, the capital that would ordinarily have been invested in overseas trade was poured into the railroads and other projects for opening up the western country.

But it was the Baltimore Clipper with its fore and aft rig on raking masts and stem that gave the real impetus to American shipbuilding. Not only did it change the olden lines of naval architecture but it established the commercial prestige of Baltimore. This port immediately became a noted maritime centre and during the war with France, *The Constellation*—The Yankee Race Horse, as the French called her—*The Maryland*, *The Baltimore*, *The Chesapeake*, *The Patapsco*, *The Montezuma*, *The Enterprise* and several others were built in Baltimore for the reorganized U. S. Navy. About one-third of the ships that were in the U. S. Navy in 1812 were built in Baltimore and Maryland furnished one-fifth of the officers and one-eighth of the men who served in the navy during that war. When Congress authorized the use of privateers as a volunteer auxiliary of the navy, more of these privately armed ships were commissioned in Baltimore than in any other port, while many ships that were credited to other cities were either built in Baltimore or from Baltimore models. The naval annals of no country surpass in bravery the deeds that were performed by Baltimore privateersmen during the early wars of the Republic and Maryland is proud of Joshua Barney, Stephen Decatur, John Rodgers, Alexander Murray and a score of others who served on privateers before they were called into the regular naval service; and of Boyle, Stafford, Lively and others who commanded Baltimore Clippers during the War of 1812. Many of these men went into the merchant marine after these wars were over



and carried the Stars and Stripes around the world, and by 1810 Baltimore had become the third city of commercial importance in America. Largely due to the influence of Baltimore Clippers the population of this city was progressively doubled each decade, between 1790 and 1840, and one of the incentives for building the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad—the first railroad in America—was to provide an outlet for the cargoes that were brought back to this port by Baltimore Clippers. In recent years, iron and steam have largely pushed the old wooden ships off the ocean and the art of seamanship has become a more prosaic occupation of taking the shortest route between two ports. But to the fame of this fair city those graceful creations which seemed “as if about to rise and fly in the air” had become known around the world by the distinctive name of Baltimore Clippers and their reputation still lingers in the minds of those who love the romance of the sea.

---

## EARLY MARYLAND NEWSPAPERS.†

---

### A LIST OF TITLES

*compiled by*

GEORGE C. KEIDEL, PH. D.

Entries prefixed with an \* are in Maryland Historical Society's Collection.

(Continued from Vol. XXIX, p. 322.)

### ADDITIONS

1805

Baltimore Evening Post; Mercantile Daily Advertiser.

1807

[Baltimore] Anti-Democrat.

[Baltimore] North American and Mercantile Daily Advertiser.

† Copyright, 1935, by George C. Keidel.

[Easton] People's Monitor.  
Fell's Point Commercial Advertiser.  
Fell's Point Federal Union.

1808

[Easton] People's Monitor.

1809

[Frederick] Freeman of Frederick.

1813

[Baltimore] National Museum and Weekly Gazette.

1814

[Baltimore] National Museum and Weekly Gazette.  
\* Baltimore Patriot and Evening Advertiser.

1816

\* Baltimore Telegraphe.  
[Easton] People's Monitor.  
[Uniontown] Star of Federalism.

1818

\* [Baltimore] Journal of the Times.

1820

\* [Annapolis] Religious and Literary Repository.

1825

Chestertown Telegraph.

1826

Chestertown Telegraph.  
[Chestertown] Telegraph.

1827

[Baltimore] North American, or, Weekly Journal  
of Politics, Science and Literature.  
[Chestertown] Telegraph.

1828

[Chestertown] Telegraph.

1829

[Chestertown] Telegraph.

[Easton] Star-Democrat.

[Frederick] Political Examiner and Public Advertiser.

1830

[Chestertown] Kent Bugle.

[Chestertown] Telegraph.

1831

[Chestertown] Kent Bugle.

1832

[Chestertown] Kent Bugle.

Chestertown Inquirer.

1833

Baltimore Episcopal Methodist.

[Bel-Air] Mirror of Mirth.

[Chestertown] Kent Bugle.

[Taney-Town] Maryland Recorder.

1834

\* Baltimore Athenaeum.

[Baltimore] Saturday Evening Star.

[Belle-Air] Mirror of Mirth.

[Chestertown] Kent Bugle.

Easton Gazette.

Hagerstown Free Press.

1835

\* Baltimore Athenaeum.

[Baltimore] Weekly Critic.

[Chestertown] Kent Bugle.

Easton Gazette.

1836

- \* [Baltimore] Eastern Express.
- [Chestertown] Kent Bugle.
- Easton Gazette.

1837

- \* [Baltimore] Eastern Express.
- [Chestertown] Kent Bugle.
- Easton Gazette.
- [Manchester] Messenger.

1838

- \* [Baltimore] Southern Universalist, devoted to religion, morality, and rights of man.
- Baltimorer Intelligenzblatt.
- [Chestertown] Kent Bugle.
- Easton Gazette.
- Hagerstown Courier and Enquirer.
- [Hagerstown] Washington County Democrat.

1839

- [Annapolis] Democratic Herald.
- [Baltimore] Allgemeine Deutsche Schulzeitung.
- Baltimore Athenaeum & Visiter.
- [Centreville] Weekly Sentinel and General Advertiser.
- Easton Gazette.

1840

- [Annapolis] Democratic Herald.
- [Baltimore] Allgemeine Deutsche Schulzeitung.
- Baltimore Spy.
- [Centreville] Weekly Sentinel and General Advertiser.

1841

- [Annapolis] Democratic Herald.

## 1842

[Annapolis] Democratic Herald.  
[Williamsport] Republican Banner.

## 1843

[Annapolis] Democratic Herald.  
[Baltimore] American Whig.  
Baltimore Republican and Argus.  
[Cumberland] Maryland Gazette.  
[Ellicott's Mills] Howard Free Press.

## 1844

[Annapolis] Democratic Herald.  
Baltimore Republican and Argus.  
[Ellicott's Mills] Howard Free Press.

## 1845

[Annapolis] Democratic Herald.  
[Ellicott's Mills] Howard Free Press.  
\* Westminster Carroltonian.

## 1846

[Annapolis] Democratic Herald.  
[Baltimore] Eastern Baltimore Mail.  
[Baltimore] Katholische Kirchen-Zeitung.  
\* [Baltimore] Western Continent.  
[Centreville] Times and Advertiser.  
[Westminster] Carroll County Democrat.

## 1847

[Annapolis] Democratic Herald.  
[Baltimore] Maryland Temperance Herald.  
[Baltimore] Katholische Kirchen-Zeitung.  
[Hagerstown] Weekly Herald of Freedom.  
[Rockville] Maryland Reformer.  
[Westminster] Carroll County Democrat.

## 1848

Baltimore Saturday Visiter.  
[Bel Air] Harford Gazette.  
[Hagerstown] Weekly Herald of Freedom.  
[Westminster] Carroll County Democrat.

## 1849

[Baltimore] Catholic Mirror.  
Baltimore Saturday Visitor.  
\* [Baltimore] Western Continent.  
[Bel Air] Harford Gazette.  
[Hagerstown] Weekly Herald of Freedom.  
[Westminster] Carroll County Democrat.  
[Williamsport] Modern Times and Home Journal.

## 1850

[Annapolis] Civil, Military, and Naval Gazette.  
[Baltimore] Wecker.  
[Ellicott's Mills] Howard Free Press.  
[Westminster] American Sentinel.  
[Westminster] Carroll County Democrat.  
[Williamsport] Modern Times and Home Journal.

## 1851

[Baltimore] Dental Times and Advertiser.  
[Baltimore] Traveller.

## 1852

[Annapolis] Maryland State Capital Gazette.  
[Baltimore] Dental Times and Advertiser.  
[Reisterstown] Baltimore County Whig.

## 1853

[Hagerstown] Herald of Freedom.

## 1854

[Baltimore] Bote der Neuen Kirche.

[Baltimore] Spirit of '76.

\* Baltimore Weekly.

1855

Baltimore Weekly Dispatch.

[Baltimore] Täglicher Baltimore Wecker.

1856

Baltimore Weekly Dispatch.

[Cumberland] Miners Journal.

[Frederick] Weekly Herald.

1857

[Baltimore] American Democrat.

[Belair] Southern Aegis and Intelligencer.

Centreville Weekly Sentinel and General Advertiser.

[Cumberland] Miners Journal.

[Ellicott's Mills] Rural Southerner.

[Frederick] Weekly Herald.

[Havre de Grace] Harford Madisonian and

Havre de Grace Advertiser.

1858

[Baltimore] American Democrat.

Baltimore Weekly Dispatch.

Centreville Weekly Sentinel and General Advertiser.

[Cumberland] Miners Journal.

[Frederick] Weekly Herald.

Frostburg Gazette and Miners' Record.

[Havre de Grace] Harford Madisonian and

Havre de Grace Advertiser.

[Princess Anne] Somerset Union.

1859

[Baltimore] American Democrat.

\* [Baltimore, etc.] Washington Christian Advocate.

Baltimore Weekly American.

Baltimore Weekly Dispatch.



Centreville Weekly Sentinel and General Advertiser.

[Cumberland] Miners Journal.

\* [Edgewood] Weekly Magpie. [Nos. 1-7 were  
issued in manuscript].

[Frederick] Weekly Herald.

[Havre de Grace] Harford Madisonian and  
Havre de Grace Advertiser.

[New Windsor] True American.

[Princess Anne] Somerset Union.  
Salisbury Sentinel.

[Towsontown] Maryland Standard.

[Towsontown?] Possum Hollow Gazette.

### 1860

[Baltimore] American Democrat.

[Baltimore] Argus.

[Baltimore] Daily American.

[Baltimore] Religions-Freund.

[Baltimore, etc.] Washington Christian Advocate.

Baltimore Weekly American.

[Bel Air] National American.

[Boonsboro] Odd Fellow.

[Cambridge] Eagle.

[Cambridge] Weekly Intelligencer.

[Centreville] Weekly Sentinel and General Advertiser.

[Cumberland] Miners Journal.

[Frederick] Weekly Herald.

Frostburg Gazette.

[Havre de Grace] Harford Madisonian and  
Havre de Grace Advertiser.

[Havre de Grace] Harford Weekly Visitor.  
Laurel Beacon.

[New Windsor] Carroll County Herald.

[Princess Ann] Patriot.

[Princess Ann] Somerset Union.

[Upper Marlboro] Advertiser.

---

## CHEW FAMILY.

By FRANCIS B. CULVER.

## ARMORIAL BEARINGS.

CHEW (of England).—*Argent, a chevron sable, on a chief azure three leopard's faces or* ("Thomas Book," pages 252-253).<sup>1</sup>

CHEW (of "Cliveden," Pa.).—*Gules, a chevron or, on a chief of the second three leopard's faces proper* (Zieber).<sup>2</sup>

The origin of the Chew family arms is obscure. Likewise, we encounter a difficulty in attempting to establish positively the place of nativity of John Chew, ancestor of the Maryland family. Chew Hundred, embracing the parishes of Chew Magna and Chewstoke, and Chewton Hundred, embracing the parishes of Chewton-Mendip and Chew Keynsham, were located in Somersetshire, England. At Chew Magna is Chew Court, the manorial mansion, and a few miles farther south are the ruins of Chew Priory, established under royal charter granted in the fourteenth century by Edward III. Chief Justice Benjamin Chew (1722-1810) named his countryseat, built in 1761 at Germantown, Pennsylvania, "Cliveden" (Cleveden) and there is a Clevedon in County Somerset. All of which seems to support the family tradition to the effect that the American Chew ancestor of this family came from Somersetshire, England. A certain John Chew, Vicar of Walden St. Paul's (Abbots Walden), Hertfordshire, was buried 10 October 1558. There were Chews also in Lancashire. The "Somerset evidences" are not conclusive, of course; but there is every reason to believe that the family name Chew is a surname of local origin (*i. e.*, de Chewe).

<sup>1</sup> From "a miscellaneous collection of arms," reported by the Heralds' College of London.

<sup>2</sup> From the impress of the seal ring of Dr. Samuel Chew (1693-1743) of "Maidstone," Md., and later of Pennsylvania.

1. JOHN<sup>1</sup> CHEW came to Virginia in the ship *Charity* in 1621 or 1622 and his wife Sarah came about a year later in the *Sea Flower*. Both were living at Hog Island, opposite Jamestown, in 1624 (Hotten's "Emigrants," page 237).

He was a merchant and was evidently a man of substance since he owned a house at Jamestown shortly after his arrival, as is shown by a grant in 1624 to "John Chew, merchant," of one rood, nine poles, near his dwelling house in James City (Va. Mag., I. 87). In 1636 he had grants for some 1200 acres "in the County of Charles River," later called York County, and had probably been living in that locality for some years previously (Va. Mag., V. 341-342).

He represented Hog Island in the Virginia House of Burgesses 1623-1624 and 1627, and was a member for York County 1642-1644 (Colonial Va. Register, pages 53, 54, 63). He was also one of the justices of York County in 1624 and 1652 (Va. Mag., I. 197). His first wife Sarah died before 1651, and in that year he executed a deed (recorded in York County) in view of his intended marriage with Mrs. Rachel Constable (Va. Mag., I. 197). His sons Samuel and Joseph Chew are mentioned in the York County records in 1657 and 1659 respectively, and it appears from the same records that in 1668 John Chew was dead and his son Samuel was living in Anne Arundel County, Maryland.

John Chew and Sarah his first wife had issue, with perhaps other children, as follows:

2. I. SAMUEL<sup>2</sup> CHEW, born *circa* 1630, died 15 March 1676/7 (*of whom later*).
- II. Joseph<sup>2</sup> Chew, born 1637, died 12 February 1715/6; married 27 December 1669, Margaret (—) Mills, widow of Thomas Mills of Anne Arundel County, Maryland. The age of "Joseph Chew, Sr., of Anne Arundel County," is recorded, in 1713, as 76 years (*Chancery Records*, Annapolis, Liber PL., folio 19), and his nephew Samuel Chew recorded in the old Chew family Bible: "My onkel Joseph Chew died 12 February 1715/6, being . . . years of age." It has been assumed that Joseph Chew was the progenitor of the Larkin Chew family of Spotsylvania County, Virginia, through a hypothetical first marriage with a "Miss Larkin." In "The Thomas Book," by the Rev. Lawrence Buck-

ley Thomas, D. D., pages 276-284, under the caption "Chew, of Virginia," this line is traced from Larkin Chew through several generations.

2. SAMUEL<sup>2</sup> CHEW (*John*<sup>1</sup>) was born about 1630 in Virginia, and died 15 March 1676/7 (old style) in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. He moved from Virginia to Maryland before 1659 and took up his abode in Anne Arundel County. He entered his rights, 16 July 1659, for transporting himself, Robert Crouch, Thomas Madders and Hannah Rogers, and received a warrant for 400 acres (Md. Land Office, Liber 4, folio 54).

He represented Anne Arundel County in the Maryland Assembly in 1661 (Md. Arch., I. 396), was High Sheriff of the county in 1663 (*ibid.*, III. 481), and was one of its justices in 1665 and 1668 (*ibid.*, III. 534; V. 30). He was commissioned, 23 July 1669, a member of the Council of Maryland and a justice of the Provincial Court (*ibid.*, V. 54), and retained his seat in the council until his death (Liber C. D., folio 427; Md. Arch., II. 254, 377, 433; XV. 23, 75, 109, *et seq.*). In 1675 he was Colonel of the militia of Anne Arundel County (Md. Arch., XV. 59) and in this capacity was ordered to raise forces for defence against the Indians (*ibid.*, 47). He was also a member of the Council of War which convened 20 July 1676. He died, according to his family record, on the 15th of March 1676/7 (old style), leaving, among other bequests, "his seale gold ring" to his brother Joseph Chew.

Col. Samuel Chew married, about 1658, Anne Ayres, only daughter and heiress of William Ayres of Nansemond County, Virginia, who came to Maryland with his family before June 1652. On the 5th of October 1653, "Mr. William Ayres" demands land for transporting himself, Sarah his wife (then deceased), Ann Ayres his daughter, and nine servants" before June 1652; and Martha his now wife, and Margaret Sammes, his servant, since June 1652 (Md. Land Office, Liber A. B. H., folio 348). On 6 June 1663, Samuel Chew assigns to Sarah Marsh any rights that remain upon record "due to my father-in-law William Ayres" (*ibid.*, Liber V, folios 338, 339), and there is upon record at Portsmouth, Va., a power of attorney

from "Samuel Chew, Esq., of Herrington, Anne Arundel County, Maryland, and Anne his wife sole daughter and heiress of Mr. William Ayres late of Nansemond County, Virginia, deceased" (Va. Mag., I. 197).

Mrs. Anne Chew survived her husband and died 13 April 1695. She was a prominent member of the Society of Friends, and their monthly meetings were long held at her house on Herring Bay. Col. Samuel and Anne (Ayres) Chew had issue as follows:

3. I. SAMUEL<sup>3</sup> CHEW, born *circa* 1660, died 10 October 1718 (*of whom later*).
4. II. JOSEPH<sup>3</sup> CHEW, born *circa* 1662/5, died 1 February 1704/5 (*of whom later*).
- III. Nathaniel<sup>3</sup> Chew, died after 20 February 1695/6. He inherited "Poppinjay," 500 acres, in Calvert County, Md.
5. IV. WILLIAM<sup>3</sup> CHEW, died 28 February 1709/10 (*of whom later*).
6. V. BENJAMIN<sup>3</sup> CHEW, born 12 April 1671, died 3 March 1699/1700 (*of whom later*).
- VI. John<sup>3</sup> Chew, died 17 February 1696/7.
- VII. Caleb<sup>3</sup> Chew, died 8 May 1698. He was in his nonage in 1695.
- VIII. Sarah<sup>3</sup> Chew, died 1740; married Captain Edward Burgess.
- IX. Anne<sup>3</sup> Chew, died 28 January 1699/1700.

3. SAMUEL<sup>3</sup> CHEW (*Samuel*<sup>2</sup>, *John*<sup>1</sup>) was born, about 1660, in Maryland and died 10 October 1718 in Anne Arundel County. By the terms of his father's will he inherited the home plantation "Herrington," on Herring Bay, and 300 acres called "Chew's Right," on Poplar Ridge. In his will dated 16 July and proved 31 October 1718 (Annapolis, Liber 14, folio 669), he is styled "merchant." His "landed estate," in addition to the tracts mentioned above, comprised "Ayres" (600 acres) at Herring Bay; "Wells," "Wells Hills," "West Wells" and "Little Wells" which he and Nehemiah Birekhead bought of George Wells; also, 318 acres bought of James Heath, being parts of "Burrage," "Burrage Blossom" and "Burrage's End"; and a parcel of land which he bought of Nathaniel Rigbie.

He married (1), 14 April 1682, Anne —, who died 8 April 1702, and had issue (*infra*). He married (2), 29 June

1704, Elizabeth (—) Coale, widow of William Coale. She died 27 February 1709/10, *sine prole*. By his first wife Anne, Samuel Chew had issue as follows:

7. I. SAMUEL<sup>4</sup> CHEW, born 28 May 1683, died 31 October 1736 (*of whom later*).
- II. Ann<sup>4</sup> Chew, born 2 July 1685, died 24 January 1694/5.
8. III. JOHN<sup>4</sup> CHEW, born 8 April 1687, died 1718 (*of whom later*).
- IV. Joseph<sup>4</sup> Chew, born 1 April 1689, died young.
- V. Benjamin<sup>4</sup> Chew, born 1 April 1689, died 18 April 1698.
9. VI. NATHANIEL<sup>4</sup> CHEW, born 5 August 1692, died 30 January 1727/8 (*of whom later*).
10. VII. JOSEPH<sup>4</sup> CHEW, born 28 April 1696, died February 1754 (*of whom later*).

4. JOSEPH<sup>3</sup> CHEW (*Samuel*<sup>2</sup>, *John*<sup>1</sup>) was born about 1662/5 and died 1 February 1704/5 in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. By the terms of his father's will he inherited a tract of 450 acres of land called "Sanetley." In Joseph Chew's will, proved 7 June 1705, the testator mentions his "son-in-law" (*i. e.*, stepson) Samuel Battee. He married (1), 17 November 1685, Mary Smith. He married (2), *ante* 1690, Mrs. Elizabeth (Hanslap) Battee<sup>3</sup> who was born about 1670 and died in 1716. She was one of the daughters of Henry Hanslap (died 1698) of Anne Arundel County. The will of Mrs. Elizabeth Chew, widow, was dated 23 April and proved 27 May 1716 (Annapolis, Liber 14, folio 96). She mentions her sons Samuel Battee, Joseph Chew and Henry Chew, who inherit the residue of her estate; her grandsons Joseph and Henry Chew; her granddaughter Elizabeth Chew; and her sister Susannah Gassaway. Her "brother" (*i. e.*, brother-in-law) Thomas Gassaway was appointed executor of the will, which requests that the testatrix be buried in Herring Creek graveyard.

Joseph and Elizabeth (Hanslap) Chew had issue as follows:

11. I. JOSEPH<sup>4</sup> CHEW, born 1689 (*of whom later*).
12. II. HENRY<sup>4</sup> CHEW, born 1693 (*of whom later*).

---

<sup>3</sup> "The Thomas Book" and other authorities err in giving her maiden surname as "Gassaway."

**5. WILLIAM<sup>3</sup> CHEW** (*Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) died 28 February 1709/10 in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. By the terms of his father's will he inherited a lot of ground in the town of Herrington.

He married, 20 December 1690, Sydney Wynn, daughter of Thomas and Martha Wynn of Pennsylvania, and had issue as follows:

13. I. BENJAMIN<sup>4</sup> CHEW, born about 1700, died 1762 (*of whom later*).
- II. SYDNEY<sup>4</sup> CHEW, married Charles Pierpont (died 1748).

**6. BENJAMIN<sup>3</sup> CHEW** (*Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born 13 February 1670/1 and died 3 March 1699/1700. He married, 8 December 1692, Elizabeth Benson (born 1677), daughter of John and Elizabeth (Smith) Benson of Calvert County, Maryland. She married (2), 24 September 1702, Richard Bond of Calvert County, and died in 1725.

Benjamin and Elizabeth (Benson) Chew had issue as follows:

14. I. SAMUEL<sup>4</sup> CHEW, born 30 October 1693 and died 16 June 1743 (*of whom later*).
- II. Elizabeth<sup>4</sup> Chew, born 13 March 1694/5, died 9 February 1726/7; married 22 December 1710 Kensey Johns (1689-1729).
- III. Ann<sup>4</sup> Chew, born 14 October 1696.
- IV. Mary<sup>4</sup> Chew, born in December 1698.

**7. SAMUEL<sup>4</sup> CHEW** (*Samuel<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born 28 May 1683 and died 31 October 1736 in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. He was a merchant, engaged in commerce and registered his own sailing vessels. He left to his three surviving sons the tracts "Ayres," "Carter Bennett," "Chew's Fortune," "Upper Bennett" and "Abington Manor."

He married, 26 August 1703, Mary Harrison, daughter of Richard and Elizabeth (Smith) Harrison, who was born 10 October 1684 and died 24 August 1725; and by her had issue as follows:

15. I. SAMUEL<sup>5</sup> CHEW, born *circa* 1704, died 15 January 1736/7 (*of whom later*).
- II. Ann<sup>5</sup> Chew, died 1777; married, 11 August 1724, Philip Thomas (1694-1762), son of Samuel and Mary Thomas.



- III. Elizabeth<sup>5</sup> Chew, born 18 October 1709, died 29 July 1719.
- IV. John<sup>5</sup> Chew, born 19 September 1711, died 21 March 1726/7.
- V. Mary<sup>5</sup> Chew, born 1714, died 10 August 1770; married John Hepbourne.
- 16. VI. RICHARD<sup>5</sup> CHEW, born May 1716, died 24 June 1769 (*of whom later*).
- VII. Francis<sup>5</sup> Chew, died 24 May 1720.
- 17. VIII. FRANCIS<sup>5</sup> CHEW, born 1721, died 11 November 1775 (*of whom later*).
- IX. Elizabeth<sup>5</sup> Chew, born 11 June 1725, died 25 June 1726.

8. JOHN<sup>4</sup> CHEW (*Samuel<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born 8 April 1687 and died in 1718 in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. He is styled "merchant," in the records.

John Chew is spoken of as deceased in the will of his father Samuel Chew dated 16 July 1718. His widow however did not take up the administration of his estate until November of that year, when she as administratrix filed a bond, bearing date of November 4th, in the amount of £3000 sterling (*Test. Proc., Annapolis, Liber 23, folio 257*).

He married, in 1708, Elizabeth Harrison, who was a daughter of Richard and Elizabeth (Smith) Harrison, and a sister of Mary Harrison, the wife of John Chew's brother Samuel Chew. Mrs. Elizabeth Chew survived her husband and married, in 1722, Elihu Hall (*Friends Records*).

John and Elizabeth (Harrison) Chew had issue as follows:

- 18. I. SAMUEL<sup>5</sup> CHEW, born *circa* 1709, died 1749 (*of whom later*).
- II. Anne<sup>5</sup> Chew, born *circa* 1711, married 17 August 1727 Joseph Hopkins (1706-1784), a Quaker, and moved to Harford County, Maryland.
- III. Sarah<sup>5</sup> Chew, married, 5 October 1732, Charles Worthington (1701-1774) of Harford County, Md.
- IV. Mary<sup>5</sup> Chew, died 1779; married, 11 October 1736, Peregrine Ward (1709-1759) of Cecil County, Md. This marriage was performed in Baltimore County, but is recorded in the register of St. Stephen's Parish, Cecil County. The marriage was evidently an elopement, since the bride's family were Quakers. The officiating clergyman was the Rev. Stephen Wilkinson, rector of Spesutia Church, St. George's Parish, Baltimore (now Harford) County.

9. NATHANIEL<sup>4</sup> CHEW (*Samuel<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born 5 August 1692 and died 30 January 1727/8 in Anne Arundel

County, Maryland. In his will dated 12 January and proved 21 February 1728 he mentions his brother Samuel Chew, Sr., and Samuel Chew of "Maidstone."

He married Mary — (died 24 August 1728), and had issue as follows:

- I. Nathaniel<sup>s</sup> Chew.
- II. Joseph<sup>s</sup> Chew.
- III. Ann<sup>s</sup> Chew.

**10. JOSEPH<sup>4</sup> CHEW** (*Samuel<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born 28 April 1696 and died February 1754. He married Sarah — and had issue as follows:

- I. Thomas<sup>s</sup> Chew.
- II. Elizabeth<sup>s</sup> Chew.
- III. Susannah<sup>s</sup> Chew.

**11. JOSEPH<sup>4</sup> CHEW** (*Joseph<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born, about 1689, in Maryland and died, after 1756, in Virginia. By the terms of his father's will, proved 7 June 1705 in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, he inherited (subject to an entail) the tracts of land called "Yarrow" (500 acres) and "Yarrow Head" (500 acres), lying on the north side of the Potomac River in Prince George's County; "Sanetley" (450 acres), and "Chew's Meadows" on the west side of the Patuxent (*Rent Rolls*, Calvert and Prince George's counties). After his second marriage, and before 1756, he moved to Virginia and lived at Alexandria.

He married (1), 23 January 1710, Mary Ford and (2) Mrs. Mercy (—) Mauduit, who survived him and died, about 1775, in Virginia. By his first wife, Joseph Chew had issue as follows:

- 19. I. JOSEPH<sup>5</sup> CHEW (*of whom later*).
- II. John<sup>s</sup> Chew, born 1713 in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. He married, moved to Virginia, and had issue as follows:
  - (a) John<sup>s</sup> Chew, of Loudoun County, Va.
  - (b) Roger<sup>s</sup> Chew, of Alexandria, Va.
- III. Henry<sup>s</sup> Chew.
- IV. Samuel<sup>s</sup> Chew.
- V. Elizabeth<sup>s</sup> Chew, married Richard Weightman.

**12.** HENRY<sup>4</sup> CHEW (*Joseph<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born in 1693, and moved to Calvert County, Maryland. By the terms of his father's will he inherited (subject to entail) the tracts of land called "The Perches" and "Arches Meadows" in Calvert County, Maryland. He was ancestor of the Harford County Chews.

He married Elizabeth — and had issue as follows:

- I. Henry<sup>5</sup> Chew, moved to Calvert County.
- 20. II. JOSEPH<sup>5</sup> CHEW, born 24 August 1719 (*of whom later*).

**13.** BENJAMIN<sup>4</sup> CHEW (*William<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born about 1700 and died in 1762. He moved to Cecil County, Maryland, before 1737; was appointed a Justice of the Peace, took the oath of office and served from 1743 to 1762 (*Md. Com. Book*, pages 60-148). He was disowned by the Nottingham Friends Meeting in October 1755. His will was dated June 1761 and proved 4 January 1763.

He married, in January 1726/7, Sarah Bond (died 1769) and had issue as follows:

- 21. I. BENJAMIN<sup>5</sup> CHEW (*of whom later*).
- II. Sarah<sup>5</sup> Chew.
- III. Phinehas<sup>5</sup> Chew, living in 1768.
- IV. Mary<sup>5</sup> Chew, married, 29 July 1765, Thomas Elliott of Cecil County, Md.
- V. Ann<sup>5</sup> Chew, married, 27 November 1768, Isaac Van Bibber of Cecil County, Md.
- VI. Henrietta<sup>5</sup> Chew, married (1), in 1772, Samuel C. Davey; married (2), in 1783, John James.

**14.** SAMUEL<sup>4</sup> CHEW (*Benjamin<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born 30 October 1693 and died 16 June 1743. He was styled Samuel Chew "of Maidstone," a tract of land lying on the west side of Herring Creek Bay near Annapolis, Md., and was also known as Dr. Samuel Chew. He moved before 1740 to Dover, Delaware, and was appointed in 1741 Chief Justice of "the three lower counties"—Newcastle, Sussex and Kent—then belonging to Pennsylvania (Keith's "Provincial Councillors of Pennsylvania," page 325).

He married (1), 22 October 1715, Mary Galloway (1697-

1734), daughter of Samuel and Anne (Webb) Galloway, and had issue as follows:

- I. Sarah<sup>5</sup> Chew, born 23 July 1716, died February 1717.
- II. Ann<sup>5</sup> Chew, born 4 January 1719, died 2 October 1723.
- III. Elizabeth<sup>5</sup> Chew, born 25 November 1720; married in 1749 Edward Tilghman (born 1713).
- 22. IV. BENJAMIN<sup>5</sup> CHEW, born 29 November 1722, died 20 January 1810 (*of whom later*).
- V. Ann<sup>5</sup> Chew, born 13 April 1725; married *circa* 1745 Samuel Galloway (died 1785).
- VI. Mary<sup>5</sup> Chew, born 27 June 1727, died 28 May 1728.
- VII. Samuel<sup>5</sup> Chew, born 29 April 1728, died 29 June 1729.
- VIII. Samuel<sup>5</sup> Chew, born 3 August 1730, died 3 November 1730.
- IX. Henrietta<sup>5</sup> Chew, born 17 March 1732, died June 1732.

He married (2), 29 September 1736, Mrs. Mary (Paca) Galloway, daughter of Aquila Paca, and had issue as follows:

- X. Samuel<sup>5</sup> Chew, born 24 August 1737, died 25 May 1809; married Anna Maria Frisby, daughter of Peregrine Frisby, and died at Chestertown, Md., *sine prole*. He was a Judge of the Supreme Court for the three lower counties of Delaware, and Judge of Oyer and Terminer in 1773.
- XI. Mary<sup>5</sup> Chew, born 6 September 1739, died 1 May 1740.
- XII. John<sup>5</sup> Chew, born 21 March 1740, died 15 December 1807 at Chestertown, Md., unmarried.

**15. SAMUEL<sup>5</sup> CHEW** (*Samuel<sup>4</sup>, Samuel<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born about 1704 and died 15 January 1736/7 in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. He was styled Samuel Chew, "gentleman," in the records. In his will dated 13 January and proved 3 March 1736/7 at Annapolis, Md., he mentions "my kinsman Benjamin Chew of Cecil County."

He married, about 1727, Henrietta Maria Lloyd (daughter of Philemon Lloyd), who married (2), in 1740, Daniel Dulany, Sr. (1686-1753) and died 10 December 1765; by whom he had issue as follows:

- 23. I. SAMUEL<sup>6</sup> CHEW, died in 1786 (*of whom later*).
- II. Henrietta Maria<sup>6</sup> Chew, born in 1731 and died 17 May 1762; married, 18 February 1748, Edward Dorsey (died 1760).
- III. Philemon Llyod<sup>6</sup> Chew, died 17 March 1770 *sine prole*.
- IV. Bennett<sup>6</sup> Chew, married, in January 1763, Anna Maria Tilgh-

man (daughter of Edward). He died in Baltimore, having had issue Edward Chew, who died *sine prole*.

V. Margaret<sup>e</sup> Chew, married, 13 October 1751, John Beale Bordley (1727-1804).

VI. Ann Mary<sup>e</sup> Chew, died 15 January 1774; married, 26 May 1763, William Paca (1740-1799), a signer of the Declaration of Independence, from Maryland, and later a Governor of the State.

**16. RICHARD<sup>5</sup> CHEW** (*Samuel<sup>4</sup>, Samuel<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born 16 May 1716 and died 24 June 1769 at Herring Bay, Anne Arundel County, Maryland.

He married, 5 January 1749/50, Mrs. Sarah (Lock) Chew (1721-1791), widow of his cousin Samuel Chew (died 1749), and daughter of William Lock (1679-1732).

Richard and Sarah (Lock) Chew had issue as follows:

- I. Mary<sup>e</sup> Chew, born 27 December 1750, died 23 November 1793; married (1), 10 February 1767, Alexander Hamilton Smith, married (2) — Lyles.
24. II. RICHARD<sup>6</sup> CHEW, born 10 April 1753, died 6 June 1801 (*of whom later*).
- III. Samuel<sup>e</sup> Chew, born 9 December 1755, died 1 February 1785, unmarried.
- IV. Lock<sup>e</sup> Chew, born 14 November 1757, died 9 December 1793, *sine prole*.
- V. Francis<sup>e</sup> Chew, born 10 July 1760.
- VI. Sarah Lock<sup>e</sup> Chew, born 20 November 1761; married 1789 Nathan Lane.
25. VII. PHILEMON LLOYD<sup>6</sup> CHEW, born 23 July 1765 (*of whom later*).

**17. FRANCIS<sup>5</sup> CHEW** (*Samuel<sup>4</sup>, Samuel<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born in 1721 and died 11 November 1775.

He married, 26 February 1749/50, Mary Lingan (died 1764) and had issue as follows:

- I. Samuel<sup>e</sup> Chew, born 29 January 1755.
- II. Ann<sup>e</sup> Chew, born 15 May 1759.
- III. Richard<sup>e</sup> Chew, born 19 October 1761.

**18. SAMUEL<sup>5</sup> CHEW** (*John<sup>4</sup>, Samuel<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born about 1709, and died in 1749 in London. He married Sarah Lock (1721-1791), daughter of William and Sarah (Harrison) Lock. She married again, 5 January 1749/50, Richard Chew (1716-1769), a cousin of her first husband.

Samuel and Sarah (Lock) Chew had issue as follows:

26. I. SAMUEL<sup>6</sup> CHEW, born 1737, died 20 February 1790 (*of whom later*).
- II. John Lane<sup>6</sup> Chew, married, in 1787, Mary Wilson and had John<sup>7</sup> Chew, captain, U. S. N.
27. III. WILLIAM<sup>6</sup> CHEW, born 1746, died 9 April 1801 (*of whom later*).
- IV. Elizabeth<sup>6</sup> Chew, married (1) ——— Smith; married (2) ——— Sprigg.

**19.** JOSEPH<sup>5</sup> CHEW (*Joseph<sup>4</sup>, Joseph<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) married . . . and had issue as follows:

- I. Nathaniel<sup>6</sup> Chew, born 1748, died 22 December 1827 at West River, Anne Arundel County, *sine prole*.
28. II. JOHN<sup>6</sup> CHEW, died *circa* 1815 (*of whom later*).

**20.** JOSEPH<sup>5</sup> CHEW (*Henry<sup>4</sup>, Joseph<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born 24 August 1719 and died 22 January 1753. He moved to that portion of Baltimore County which is now Harford County, Maryland.

He married, in 1745, Sarah Sheredine, who was born 18 December 1726, died 7 January 1784; and had issue as follows:

- I. Elizabeth<sup>6</sup> Chew, born 18 July 1747, died 25 September 1806; married, 24 November 1768, John Hopkins.
- II. Susan<sup>6</sup> Chew, born 25 December 1749, died 15 December 1784; married, in 1780, Joseph Miller (born 1745), of Harford County, Md.
29. III. THOMAS SHEREDINE<sup>6</sup> CHEW, born 8 June 1752 (*of whom later*).

**21.** BENJAMIN<sup>5</sup> CHEW (*Benjamin<sup>4</sup>, William<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) married 1 May 1750 Cassandra Johns, daughter of Richard and Ann Johns of Baltimore County, and had issue as follows:

30. I. NATHANIEL<sup>6</sup> CHEW (*of whom later*).

**22.** BENJAMIN<sup>5</sup> CHEW (*Samuel<sup>4</sup>, Benjamin<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born 29 November 1722 at "Maidstone," Anne Arundel County, Maryland, and died 20 January 1810 at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He studied law at Philadelphia, went abroad in 1741 and entered the Middle Temple, Inns of Court, London. He returned to America after his father's

death, was admitted to the bar in 1746 and began practice at Dover, Delaware (formerly under the jurisdiction of Pennsylvania). He moved to Philadelphia about 1754; and built his country seat, "Cliveden," on the Germantown road, in 1761.

He was a Commissioner of Boundaries for the three lower counties of Delaware in 1751; Speaker of the House from the same district in 1753-1758; Attorney General of Pennsylvania and member of the Provincial Council 1754-1769; Register General of Wills 1765-1776; Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania 1774-1776; Judge and President of the High Court of Errors and Appeals 1791-1806 (Pa. Archives: Pa. Hist. Society Publications: Keith's "Provincial Councilors of Pennsylvania").

He married (1), 13 June 1747, Mary Galloway (died 1755), daughter of John and Mary (Thomas) Galloway, and had issue as follows:

- I. Mary<sup>a</sup> Chew, born 10 March 1748, died 22 August 1794; married, 18 May 1768, Alexander Wilcocks (1741-1801).
- II. Anna Maria<sup>a</sup> Chew, born 27 November 1749, died in November 1812, unmarried.
- III. Elizabeth<sup>a</sup> Chew, born 10 November 1751; married, 26 May 1774, Edward Tilghman (1750-1815).
- IV. Sarah<sup>a</sup> Chew, born 15 November 1753; married, 23 October 1786, John Galloway (of Samuel).
- V. Henrietta<sup>a</sup> Chew, born in September 1755, died 1756.

He married (2), 12 September 1757, Elizabeth Oswald (1732-1819), daughter James Oswald, and had issue:

31. VI. BENJAMIN<sup>a</sup> CHEW, born 30 September 1758, died 30 April 1844 (of whom later).
- VII. Margaret<sup>a</sup> Chew, born 16 December 1760, died 29 May 1824; married 18 May 1787 Col. John Eager Howard (1752-1827).
- VIII. Joseph<sup>a</sup> Chew, born 9 March 1763, died in September 1764.
- IX. Juliana<sup>a</sup> Chew, born 8 April 1765; married, 1 April 1793, Philip Nicklin.
- X. Henrietta<sup>a</sup> Chew, born 15 September 1767, died 8 March 1848, unmarried.
- XI. Sophia<sup>a</sup> Chew, born 13 November 1769; married, in 1796, Henry Philips (1767-1800) of Philadelphia.
- XII. Maria<sup>a</sup> Chew, born 22 December 1771, died 27 March 1840, unmarried.



XIII. Harriet<sup>e</sup> Chew, born 22 October 1775, died 8 April 1861; married, 17 July 1800, Charles Carroll of "Homewood," Md.

XIV. Catherine<sup>e</sup> Chew, born 3 May 1779, died 28 May 1831, unmarried.

**23. SAMUEL<sup>6</sup> CHEW** (*Samuel<sup>5</sup>, Samuel<sup>4</sup>, Samuel<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, and died in 1786. He was styled Samuel Chew "of Herring Bay." By the terms of his father's will he inherited the tract called "Ayres" and other parcels of land. In 1785 he purchased from the heirs of William Brent, of Virginia, "Kent Fort Manor" on Kent Island, Maryland, which he left to his wife Elizabeth Chew for life, with remainder to his son Samuel Lloyd Chew. In 1787 the Manor, which contained 2005 acres, was divided and the southern moiety deeded by Samuel Lloyd Chew to his mother. In 1787-1789, the property was mortgaged to Charles Carroll of Carrollton, but the mortgage seems to have been paid off later (*Md. Hist. Mag.*, VI. 254; Deed Records of Queen Anne's County, 27 June 1797). Samuel Chew also owned "Chew's Farm," a manorial estate in the southern part of Washington County, Maryland.

Samuel Chew married, about 1750/5, Elizabeth Crowley (1729-1807), who was born in Maryland and died at Sodus Point, Wayne County, New York. According to the records of St. James Parish, Herring Creek, Anne Arundel County, Maryland, they had issue as follows:

- I. Samuel Lloyd<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 6 September 1756, died in 1796; married, 1 July 1777, Dorothy Harrison, who was born 17 February 1758, of Richard and Rachel Harrison, and died 6 November 1791. Issue:
  - a. Samuel A.<sup>8</sup> Chew.
  - b. Bennett<sup>8</sup> Chew.
  - c. Henrietta Maria<sup>8</sup> Chew, married Henry C. Schnebly of Washington County, Md.
  - d. Elizabeth<sup>8</sup> Chew, married (1) William Deery; married (2) Eli Beatty of Washington County, Md.
- II. Henrietta Maria<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 21 March 1759, died 21 April 1847; married, 5 September 1775, Benjamin Galloway (1754-1831), and moved to Washington County, Md.
- III. Elizabeth<sup>7</sup> Chew, born in 1765, died 4 June 1854; married, 11 December 1781, Peregrine Fitzhugh (1759-1810). Both died at Sodus Point, Wayne County, New York.

**24.** RICHARD<sup>6</sup> CHEW (*Richard*<sup>5</sup>, *Samuel*<sup>4</sup>, *Samuel*<sup>3</sup>, *Samuel*<sup>2</sup>, *John*<sup>1</sup>) was born 10 April 1753 and died 6 June 1801. He was a Captain and afterward a Major in the Maryland Line (*Md. Arch.*, XII. 323).

He married (1), 4 February 1773, Margaret Mackall (1754-1779), daughter of James John Mackall, and had issue as follows:

- I. Richard<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 4 October 1773, died 20 June 1831; married, 20 December 1804, Elizabeth Hollyday (of Leonard).
- II. Mary Mackall<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 17 September 1776; married, in 1815, John Brengman of Kentucky.

He married (2), 2 May 1780, Frances Holland (died 26 September 1799), daughter of Thomas Holland of Calvert County, Md., and had issue as follows:

- III. Thomas Holland<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 27 October 1781, died 16 March 1840; married (1) Elizabeth Smith (d. 1825); married (2) Mary Davis (d. 1829).
- IV. William Holland<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 7 August 1784, died 11 September 1799.
- V. Sarah<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 16 March 1787, died 28 December 1790.
- VI. Philemon<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 20 February 1789, died 30 September 1850; married, 21 February 1813, Ann Maria Bowie Brookes (1789-1862).
- VII. Sarah Lock<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 28 April 1791, died young.
- VIII. Frances<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 19 April 1793.
- IX. Bettie Holland<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 19 September 1795, died 19 September 1797.
- X. Samuel Lock<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 29 July 1797, died 12 February 1798.
- XI. Bettie Holland<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 15 May 1799, died 18 October 1800.

**25.** PHILEMON LLOYD<sup>6</sup> CHEW (*Richard*<sup>5</sup>, *Samuel*<sup>4</sup>, *Samuel*<sup>3</sup>, *Samuel*<sup>2</sup>, *John*<sup>1</sup>) was born 23 July 1765. He married, 28 October 1790, Ann Bowie (1767-1827), daughter of William Bowie of Prince George's County, Md., and had issue:

- I. Margaret Bowie<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 17 September 1791; married, 14 May 1816 (*lic.*), Richard Ireland Jones.
- II. Eliza<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 14 January 1793.
- III. William Bowie<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 27 September 1794.
- IV. Richard<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 6 February 1796.
- V. Robert Bowie<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 21 February 1797.
- VI. Samuel<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 18 September 1798.

VII. Walter Bowie<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 29 November 1799.

VIII. Henry Mortimer<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 17 March 1801; married, 15 January 1833, Eliza Ann Haw.

IX. John<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 14 August 1802, died 23 August 1802.

X. Sarah Maria<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 9 December 1803.

XI. Ann Maria<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 19 October 1806.

**26.** SAMUEL<sup>6</sup> CHEW (*Samuel<sup>5</sup>, John<sup>4</sup>, Samuel<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born in 1737 and died 20 February 1790. He was styled Samuel Chew "of Wells." He was a delegate to the Maryland Conventions of 1774-1775 and a member of the Association of Freemen of Maryland (Scharf's "History of Maryland," II. 184; *Md. Arch.*).

He married (1), 3 February 1763, Sarah Weems (died 1763), daughter of James Weems, and had issue as follows:

I. Samuel<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 1763, died about 1820. He moved to Kentucky in 1805; was married twice.

He married (2) Priscilla Claggett, daughter of the Rev. Samuel and Mrs. Elizabeth (Gantt) Claggett, and had issue as follows:

II. John Hamilton<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 14 September 1771, died 22 March 1830; married (a cousin) Priscilla Elizabeth Claggett (d. 1843), daughter of the Rt. Rev. Thomas John Claggett of Maryland, first P. E. Bishop in the United States, and had issue.

III. Thomas John<sup>7</sup> Chew, died 1797; married, 14 November 1793, Margaret C. Johns, *sine prole*. She married later, Colonel Washington Bowie.

**27.** WILLIAM<sup>6</sup> CHEW (*Samuel<sup>5</sup>, John<sup>4</sup>, Samuel<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born in 1746 and died 9 September 1801. He married, in 1768, Elizabeth Reynolds (died 1801), daughter of Thomas Reynolds, and had issue as follows:

I. Sarah<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 11 July 1770, died 10 September 1843; married (1) in 1787 Allen Bowie, (2) Frisby Freeland, (3) Beverly R. Grayson.

II. Elizabeth<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 26 April 1772, died in June 1828; married — Moseby, of Kentucky.

III. Francis Holland<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 12 December 1774, died 24 August 1834; married — Calvit, of Mississippi.

- IV. Mary<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 4 June 1776, died 1 May 1821; married Thomas Reynolds, of Mississippi.
- V. William Lock<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 10 April 1778, died 17 July 1858; married, 22 October 1805, Rebecca Freeland (1785-1840).
- VI. Ann Reynolds<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 19 July 1780; married — Craig, of Kentucky.

**28.** JOHN<sup>6</sup> CHEW (*Joseph<sup>5</sup>, Joseph<sup>4</sup>, Joseph<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) died about 1815 in Prince George's County, Maryland. He married . . . and had issue as follows:

- I. Robert<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 1777, died in 1837; married Tabitha Wilson and had issue.
- II. Nathaniel<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 1785, died in 1845; married, in 1814, Martha Bird and had issue.
- III. Walter<sup>7</sup> Chew, married Mrs. — (Jones) Cobb and had issue.
- IV. John<sup>7</sup> Chew, died unmarried.
- V. Ann<sup>7</sup> Chew.
- VI. Elizabeth<sup>7</sup> Chew.
- VII. Artridge<sup>7</sup> Chew.
- VIII. Agnes<sup>7</sup> Chew, married Hanson Clark, of Montgomery County, Maryland.

**29.** THOMAS SHEREDINE<sup>6</sup> CHEW (*Joseph<sup>5</sup>, Henry<sup>4</sup>, Joseph<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born 8 June 1752 and died 15 February 1821. He married about 1790 Elizabeth Morgan, born 1 November 1772, daughter of William and Cassandra Morgan, and had issue as follows:

- I. William Morgan<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 14 July 1791; married, 12 February 1814, Anne Webster Richardson and had issue.
- II. Thomas<sup>7</sup> Chew, graduated M. D. in Baltimore; moved to Mississippi and died unmarried.
- III. Sarah<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 1 December 1792, died 13 November 1821; married, 11 April 1809, Samuel Worthington (died 1853).
- IV. Cassandra Morgan<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 12 November 1796, died 20 August 1844 unmarried.
- V. Edward Morgan<sup>7</sup> Chew, died 16 May 1878; married (1) Margaret Hopkins and (2) Caroline F. Hall, *sine prole*.
- VI. Eliza<sup>7</sup> Chew, married John W. Hopkins, son of Samuel and Rachel Hopkins, and had issue.
- VII. Margaret<sup>7</sup> Chew, died in 1865; married, in 1837, Isaac Wilson and had issue.

**30.** NATHANIEL<sup>6</sup> CHEW (*Benjamin<sup>5</sup>, Benjamin<sup>4</sup>, William<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born, after 1750, and died 22 May 1827,

in Maryland. He was a midshipman in the Continental Navy, Revolutionary War, and became a Captain. He lived in Cecil County, Maryland.

He married, 24 November 1793, Margaret Rodgers, daughter of Colonel John Rodgers, and had issue as follows:

- I. John<sup>7</sup> Chew.
- II. Benjamin Franklin<sup>7</sup> Chew.
- III. Washington Pinkney<sup>7</sup> Chew, died 7 April 1850; married, 4 January 1831, Mary Hall (died 1838). He married (2), 10 Nov. 1840, Mary C. Boyd.
- IV. Emeline R.<sup>7</sup> Chew.
- V. Henrietta Mary<sup>7</sup> Chew, married, 18 November 1841, Dr. John J. Boyd of Harford County, Md.
- VI. Elizabeth Ann<sup>7</sup> Chew.

**31.** BENJAMIN<sup>6</sup> CHEW (*Benjamin<sup>5</sup>, Samuel<sup>4</sup>, Benjamin<sup>3</sup>, Samuel<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) was born 30 September 1758 and died 30 April 1844. He was admitted to the bar of Philadelphia, Pa., in 1786.

He married, 11 December 1788, Katherine Banning (1770-1855) and had issue as follows:

- I. Samuel<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 8 December 1789, died 21 March 1795.
- II. Eliza<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 4 May 1791, died 21 March 1795.
- III. Benjamin<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 5 December 1793, died 17 August 1864; married, 11 July 1816, Margaret Elizabeth Tilghman (died 1817).
- IV. Samuel<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 19 June 1795, died 21 August 1841. Admitted to the bar of Philadelphia 1816. Died unmarried.
- V. John<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 23 January 1797, died in August 1815. Midshipman, U. S. N. Lost at sea.
- VI. Eliza Margaretta<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 19 November 1798, died 11 February 1874; married, 25 July 1822, James Murray Mason.
- VII. Henry Banning<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 11 December 1800, died 12 December 1866; married (1), 14 May 1822, Harriet Ridgely (1802-1835); married (2), 20 March 1839, Elizabeth Ann Ralston of Philadelphia (*sine prole*).
- VIII. William White<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 12 April 1803, died 12 November 1851. Sec'y. of American Legation to Russia.
- IX. Ann Sophia Penn<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 18 March 1805, died 9 May 1892, unmarried.
- X. Joseph Turner<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 12 December 1806, died in 1835.
- XI. Anthony Banning<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 24 January 1809, died in February 1854.

XII. Catherine Maria<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 12 May 1811, buried 26 October 1811.

XIII. Oswald<sup>7</sup> Chew, born 23 May 1813, died 8 June 1824. Drowned while bathing in the Schuylkill River.

NOTE.—The compiler is indebted to Messrs. Louis H. Dielman and F. Sidney Hayward for the use of their valuable and extensive gleanings, from the files of old newspapers, in the matter of marriage and death notices.

---

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY.

---

*February 11, 1935.*—The regular meeting of the Society was held to-night with Acting President Riggs in the chair.

The following named persons, having been previously nominated, were elected to membership:

*Active:*

Mr. Jackson Brandt	Mr. Frank Jacobs
Mrs. Jackson Brandt	Mr. Richard Laws Lee
Miss Louise E. Carroll	Mr. E. Randolph Wootten
Mrs. L. F. Cromwell	Maj. Wm. Burnett Wright
Mr. Edward A. Doehler	

*Associate:*

Dr. Henry Ridgely Evans

The following deaths were reported from among our members:

Dr. Henry M. Fitzhugh, on January 25th, 1935.

Mr. Willard A. Baldwin, on January 29th, 1935.

There being no further business, upon motion duly seconded and carried the regular monthly meeting adjourned and the Annual Meeting was called to order. The minutes of the Annual Meeting will be found printed in the March 1935 issue of the *Maryland Historical Magazine*.

Mr. Carl Pfeiffer, Assistant State Forester, was recognized by the Chair. Mr. Pfeiffer gave a brief sketch of the history of

Fort Frederick and this talk was followed by lantern slides showing the condition of the Fort before it was taken over by the State of Maryland. Moving pictures followed showing the condition of the Fort at the present time and the work completed, and that which is now in progress, by the C. C. C. under the direction of the State Forestry Department of Maryland.

Mr. Marye moved that the thanks of the Society be extended to Mr. Pfeiffer for his interesting pictures and talk. The motion was unanimously carried.

The Chair recognized Senator W. McCulloh Browne who gave an account of the Fort and the interest which was stirred up some years ago among the people of Maryland which made it possible to have the property purchased by the State.

Upon motion duly seconded and carried the unanimous thanks of the Society were extended to Senator Browne for his short talk.

---

*March 11th, 1935.*—The regular meeting of the Society was held to-night with President Riggs in the chair.

Mr. Louis H. Dielman presented a number of pieces of old sheet music and called particular attention to the piece "Huzza for the Constellation" printed and sold by Carr's Music Store, Baltimore, which is illustrated with a cut of the Constellation's fight with the Insurgente in 1799.

Another interesting document added to the library, by purchase, is the petition to the General Assembly asking for the division of Baltimore and Frederick Counties to form a new county to be known as Paca County.

A deposit, recently made by Mr. C. Braxton Dallam, is a manuscript copy of Lee's Farewell Address to his Army, signed by Lee and presented to the late Mr. William W. Dallam.

The following named persons were elected to Membership:

*Active:*

Mrs. Francis F. Beirne	Mr. George Renehan
Rev. A. Boyer, S. S.	Dr. Robert L. Swain
Mr. Luther Stitt Tall	

Dr. J. Hall Pleasants presented on behalf of Dr. William Stull Holt a manuscript, to be deposited in the name of the Johns Hopkins University Library, entitled "The Records of Joppa Town, 1724," which is accompanied by a plat showing the lot owners and the more important buildings.

Dr. Pleasants referred to a recent discovery of certain specimens of printing in the Land Office at Annapolis, which establish the priority of Nuthead's press at St. Mary's City over that of William Bradford at Philadelphia, in 1685.

Professor Philip Davidson of the Department of History, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Georgia, was introduced as the speaker of the evening. Professor Davidson gave a delightful talk on the "Rev. Jonathan Boucher, A Fighting Tory Parson."

At the close of the paper Dr. Pleasants moved that a vote of thanks be extended to Professor Davidson by the Society for his most interesting and delightful talk.

---

*March 28th, 1935.*—A Special Meeting of the Society was held this afternoon, at 4.45 p. m., with President Riggs in the Chair.

The only matter of business attended to was the nomination and election of members.

The following named persons were elected to Membership:

*Active:*

Miss Marjorie Albaugh	Mr. Samuel P. Mason, Jr.
Mr. Wilmer Black	Mrs. Harry Morrison
Mrs. Thomas Marshall Duer	Mrs. James Piper
Mr. James Foster	Mr. George M. Shriver
Mr. A. Brown Griswold	Mr. John Mosley Walker
Mrs. M. A. Leahy	

*Associate:*

Mrs. Harry White



The speaker, Professor Albert Hatton Gilmer of Lafayette College, was introduced and gave a splendid paper entitled "Lafayette A Hundred Years After."

At the close of the paper, upon motion duly seconded and carried, the unanimous thanks of the Society were extended to Professor Gilmer.

---

*April 8th, 1935.*—The regular meeting of the Society was held to-night with President Riggs in the Chair.

The minutes of the last regular meeting, as well as those of the Special Meeting, held on March 28th, were read and approved as read.

The following named persons were elected to Membership:

*Active:*

Mrs. William Irving Bowie	Miss Blanche L. Hoopes
Dr. Gilbert Chinard	Miss M. Ella Hoopes
Mr. Edward W. Donn, Jr.	Mr. G. Robert Howell
Mr. J. Lawrence Fox	Mr. Sam W. Pattison
Mrs. Arthington Gilpin, Jr.	Mrs. David A. Ralston
Mr. J. William Slemons	Mr. Isaac Lobe Straus

*Associate:*

Mr. Irving McKesson	Mrs. Mark Woodward
Mrs. James H. Scott	

The following deaths were reported from among our members:

Mr John Sebastian Flower, Associate, died December 19th, 1934.

Mr. George A. Colston, Active, died January 26th, 1935.

Mr. F. Highland Burns, Active, died March 30th, 1935.

Mr. James E. Hancock was recognized by the Chair. He gave a brief outline of the history of the frigate "Constellation" and offered the following Resolution:

*“Whereas, Baltimore was one of the principal ports of naval activity during the Revolutionary War, the Naval War with France and the War of 1812, and*

*“Whereas, The first officer to be appointed to the American Navy was a Baltimorean, while Maryland supplied more officers for this original navy of the United States than any other State in the Union, and*

*“Whereas, The frigate Constellation was built in Baltimore, 1796-97, and launched as the first frigate for the United States Navy when it was organized as a separate department under the Secretary of the Navy,*

*“Therefore be it Resolved, that the Maryland Historical Society endorses the Joint Senate Bill No. 87, now before Congress, and further requests that the President and The Congress of the United States repair and return the Frigate Constellation to Baltimore and station her at Fort McHenry as a memorial of Baltimore’s participation in the early naval wars of the Republic.”*

The motion was seconded by Mr. J. Alexis Shriver, and unanimously adopted by the Society.

Mr. Leander McCormick-Goodhart was introduced by President Riggs who stated that he was half American and entirely Britisher and one of the Secretaries of the British Embassy in Washington. Maryland is Mr. McCormick-Goodhart’s adopted home and he lives on an estate in Prince George’s County, and maintains a shooting lodge at one of Maryland’s most interesting places, “De la Brooke Manor” in St. Mary’s County. He is one of the Society’s most valued members and his interest in Maryland history is unbounded, and to-night we will have the pleasure of hearing his paper on “Admiral Vernon, His Marylanders and His Medals.” The one medal owned by the Society is the only one in Maryland, with the exception of Mr. McCormick-Goodhart’s collection which is the finest in existence.

Mr. McCormick-Goodhart stated that before he began his talk he would like to say a word in regard to the Resolution

adopted by the Society in regard to the "Constellation" and he hopes that the United States Navy Department will be encouraged to return to Baltimore the Frigate Constellation. He said that he was a member of the Nautical Research Society in London and several years ago it had been their good fortune to obtain England's most famous ship, "The Victory," and restore it by means of an appeal for funds which was graciously answered, and the "Victory" is now on permanent exhibition and is visited by approximately 100,000 persons per annum. He sincerely trusts that Baltimore will be successful in obtaining the Constellation.

Mr. McCormick-Goodhart's talk on "Admiral Vernon" was most interesting and a valuable addition to the records of the Society. His collection of four hundred medals of Admiral Vernon were arranged on two large tables and were examined with great interest by the members of the Society.

Mr. Shriver moved that the thanks of the Society be extended to Mr. McCormick-Goodhart for a most delightful evening.

The motion was seconded and unanimously carried.

---

## NOTES AND QUERIES.

---

I desire to correct an error in my article which appeared in vol. 26, pages 285 and 323 of the *Magazine*. Due to inaccurate misstatement that Mary Brooke (who died Oct., 14, 1808), wife of Stephen Howison (who died Feb., 1, 1815) was a daughter of Basil Brooke (c. 1714-1757) and his first wife, Dorothy Taney. Mrs. Watson M. Fairley of Raeford, N. C., has furnished me with the information of the parentage of this Mary Brooke and I desire to correct the former statement. Mary (Brooke) Howison was a daughter of John Brooke of Charles Co., Md., who died in 1763. His will, dated July 12, and probated Aug., 27, 1763, mentioned his son-in-law, Stephen Howison to whom he left a part of "Good Neighborhood" and "12 acres where he now lives being part of The End of Shuf-

fe." 4 eldest daughters: Elizabeth Stewart, *Mary Howison*, Sarah Robey and Jane Robey. 5 youngest children: William, Susannah, Charity, Walter and Chloe. His executors were his wife Sarah and Peter Robey. The will of Peter Harriott of Charles Co., dated Sept., 6, 1749 and probated Dec., 12, 1751, mentioned grandson, Peter Harriot Robey, son of John Nally Robey, and his brother, Thomas Robey. 2 daughters *Sarah Brooke* and Elizabeth Robey. Sons-in-law *John Brooke* and John Nally Robey, to be executors. From the records at the Land Office it is shown that Cert. No. 141, for 132 acres, "End of shuffle," was patented by John Brook (sic) in 1742 and surveyed for John Brook of Charles Co., for the lives of the said John Brook, Sarah, his wife, and Elizabeth Brook, his daughter, Oct., 26, 1742. The Charles County Rent Roll for 1761 shows that 124 acres, "Good Neighborhood," was surveyed for John Brook April 16, 1761 and patented on May 27th of that year. 250 acres, "Hopewells Amendment," was surveyed in Sept., 1725, for John Hopewell. Of this 75 acres was held by John Boswell and 125 acres by John Brooke later. 200 acres of this land were surveyed, Sept. 18, 1825, for John Hopewell. William Hopewell transferred 100 acres of this land to John Brook (sic), Nov., 23, 1742.

No data of the parentage of this John Brooke of Charles Co., has been found. Mrs. Fairly and I would appreciate any information that anyone could send of us him and his ancestry.

Very truly yours,

John Bailey Calvert Nicklin.

---

REID. Wanted, names of parents of Mathew Mark Reid, who was born in Maryland Aug. 28, 1815. In what county was he born?

Wanted names of parents of Thomas Cawood (Caywood), b. in Maryland April 16, 1793. He served in War of 1812, from Frederick County.

Wanted, names of parents of Jane Hodson who married George P. Chrisman in Winchester, Va. in 1787. Would like to correspond with anyone who has history of the Hodson family.

Mrs. Alta Chrisman,  
3051 Starr St., Lincoln, Neb.

BENNETT. Wanted, information concerning William Bennett and Deborah, his wife, who lived at East Bedford, Chester co. Pa.; later in Cecil co. Md. and there died before 1787. Their children were William, b. Mar. 25, 1737, lived in Berkeley co. Va.; Mary, m. Cheney; Sarah, m. Ashbridge; Deborah; and Joshua. Is this the same line as that of John or Edward Bennett in Chester co., Pa.?

Mrs. John Bennett.

37 Legare St., Charleston, S. C.

---

COUNCILMAN. Will anyone who has information on the Kunzelmann-Councilman-Counselman families of Maryland and Pennsylvania communicate with the undersigned? Data are particularly desired on Frederick of Reisterstown, Md.; Heinrich of Lykens, Dauphin co. Pa., and Philip of Tioga township, Luzerne co. Pa., and Nanticoke, Broome county, N. Y., and their ancestors and descendants. Does either of these have a service-record in the Revolutionary War?

Halsey Stevens,

Evergreen Terrace, Homer, New York.

---

SWIFT. Wanted, Revolutionary War record of Flower Swift, b. in Maryland in 1750; Captain of Militia, 1779, in Montgomery co. Va.,

Mrs. Edith Poteet Woodall,

2230, 12 Ave. North, Birmingham, Ala.

---